

# The Review of English Studies

VOL. VIII.—No. 31.

JULY, 1932.

## SOME ENGLISH PERSONAL LETTERS OF 1402

By EDITH RICKERT

Of a group of documents at the Public Record Office described as papers relating to the affairs of Elizabeth, Lady Zouche,<sup>1</sup> four are English letters of a character highly personal for their early date. The writer was the widow of Sir John Arundel (died 1391) and of William, Lord Zouche (died 1396); she died in 1408, and if her will was carried out, is buried in Tewkesbury Abbey. Through her first husband she was related to the Bohuns and so to Anne, first wife to Henry IV. Her second husband was one of the gay friends of Richard II who were banished in 1388; but Zouche returned some time later and must have married Lady Elizabeth between 1391 and 1396. About her own origin there seems to be some uncertainty (she is said to have been a daughter of Thomas, Lord Roos of Hamlake); but through both her husbands she must have been of the Court circle; and she was related by marriage to Sir William Beauchamp, whose friendship with Chaucer seems now an assured fact. The "gode lord" of the Letters who "reaggged . . . ry3th foule" on one occasion and who, in the Lady's opinion, managed his household badly, was her stepson, William, Lord Zouche (1374-1415).

Her "ry3t wel be loued frende," John Bore, whom she finds so useful in executing small commissions, is not certainly identified. A man of that name appears frequently in the Patent Rolls and Close

<sup>1</sup> E 101/512/10.

Rolls as King's clerk, dean of the chapel of the royal household, and, if all entries refer to him, a great pluralist. But as this man died in April 1402,<sup>1</sup> between the writing of the first and second Letters, the Bore of the Letters may have been a younger kinsman of the King's Chaplain.

The Letters were all written at "Eytoun," Eaton Bray in Bedfordshire. According to a Chancery Inquisition of 1273, it was surrounded by a moat with two drawbridges, one toward the park; and comprised a hall with two chambers at the ends, a great chamber, an outside chamber, a larder used as kitchen because there was no kitchen, a new chapel, a granary, and in the outer bailey stables for sixty horses and a grange, besides a cowhouse, pigsties, and other thatched outbuildings.<sup>2</sup> In Letter I there is a reference to "le Batailled chambre"—a phrase which suggests a late fourteenth century addition to the castle. There were two gardens, one of three roods and one of an acre; and the park contained twenty-eight acres of wood.

In her embattled chamber, then, Lady Elizabeth writes four letters to her good friend in London between March 18 and St. Giles Eve, 1402. She tells her troubles, asks many favours and occasionally makes return; she wishes to buy a present and to get it as cheap as possible; she sends a sample of cloth to be matched; she needs a new ribbon for a horn and she draws the width on her letter; she asks help in hiring a new butler who shall not be impudent; she grumbles about the expense of keeping "Hoigkyn" in London—he does no good there; she urges Bore and Frome to come to Eytoun and set the house in "better governance"; she is going to visit her mother and wishes to take her a pair of gold beads for a present—and they are to be of the best workmanship, whatever they cost; she wishes to stock her house at Smithfield with a pipe of white wine, and Bore must see to it; and he is to find out for her the price of a whole cloth of black velvet.

And all this is written in a kind of loosely constructed, idiomatic English which certainly suggests that the Lady is writing pretty much as she talked. Note among others such phrases as:

was at home with me at Eytoun and so I spake to him of Broke  
I pray you that ye and Chychyly will go and see the indenture

<sup>1</sup> His will, dated April 13, was proved 7 Kal. May (P.C.C. 2 Marche). It does not suggest any connection with Lady Elizabeth.

<sup>2</sup> *Victoria County History of Bedfordshire*, iii, 370.

let put them all together in the great coffer and send them home to  
 Eyton  
 more than it is ten times worth  
 that I am so long without [a butler]  
 and but ye may get the same man that ye spoke to me of  
 and the next man that goth between I shall pay you  
 send me two yard of the breadth that is marked here  
 I pray you that ye will hold on  
 do as ye think that good is  
 I wot never what he doth there [at London]  
 but great wages and dispenses he axeth for his being there  
 sent me word by the bearer of this letter  
 I have as lief that he be still at home  
 I thank God it is ever the longer the worse [!]  
 I would a prayed you that ye would have ordained me a pair beads  
 of gold for my lady my mother  
 with the quaintest [prettiest] paternoster that ye can find whatsoever  
 they cost  
 send me word what price of an whole cloth of black velvet

Perhaps these phrases suffice to show that the spoken English of Chaucer's time was not so unlike our own.

The Letters are on a heavy, coarse-grained paper, the first and third in an easy, fluent hand, the second and fourth in a stiff, cramped hand with a slightly backward tendency. The endorsements, which may possibly be Bore's, are in a third hand, much more cultivated than either of the hands in the Letters themselves.

I have tried to reproduce all peculiarities meticulously, except in introducing hyphens where absolutely needed to make sense and in disregarding final flourishes, except where they could be expanded with certainty. Abbreviations of proper names are shown by the apostrophe.

## I

[m. 2]

Ry3th wel by loued frend I Grete 3ow wel and do 3ow to wytene  
 that the lord la Zouch' was a<sup>1</sup> home with me at Eytoun and so I spake to  
 hym of Broke and of the tenaunt' [?] al so and so he hath reiagged broke  
 ry3th foule for hys doying And al so I haue spoke to hym for Calstoun<sup>1</sup>  
 and he bydd that my consell scholde come and speke with hym now at  
 london' and schewe hym the Euedenses that I haue per of and per fore  
 I pray 3ow that 3e and Chychyly wolet go and se the Endentur that ys  
 by twene hym and Me. And al so that 3e wolde I-se the Endentur that

<sup>1</sup> Calston (Wilts.), part of her dower.

ys by twene Sir Thos' zocflet' <sup>1</sup> and Me of Bechesworth', and the bond that ys by twene Jon Treygos <sup>2</sup> and Me and wanne ze han al I-do with the Endentours that ze wole late putte hem alle to gader in the grete Coffyn and sende hem hom to Eytoun. Al so I pray zow that ze wole go and byge a cloth of damask or two zif it nedith <sup>3</sup> of Grene oper red oper bleik of the lyztest pris and bere hit to the gode lord and pray hym that he wole Make the reles of Chychyly and Skot as he by-hygte Me now [?] at Eytoun. I pray zow as I triste to zow that ze ne fayle Me not of þis cloth for trule I wolde not <sup>4</sup> fayle M<sup>r</sup> [?] [B ?]rook at þis tyme for More þan hit ys x tyme worth I-wryte at Eytoun the xviij day of March'

Elyzabeth' lady zouche  
Of Eytoun

There is no address, but on the back of the sheet, in another hand, is the following :

Par le Maundement diceste lettere le dit Joh'n Bore ad achate J drap de damaske blew *que* coste lj. s. viij. d. & est deliuere al William Sieur le Souche par le dit Joh'n Bore & pur icell' le dit Joh'n ad J relese g[en]erall' de dette couenaunt & trespas pur luy sez heirs & executours perpetuelment Et auxi ij fait de doun' del corps de Thom' Scot' prisoner al dit sieur fait al dite dame/ quels ij faitez le dit Joh'n Bore ad deliuere al dite dame en le Batailled chambre a Eytoun le samady deuaunt [F ?]elip' & Jacop' lan tierce du roi H

## II

[m. 1]

Rygt wel be loued frende I grete zow wel and desyre to here of zoure wel fare and I prey zow fore my loue þat ze wyl thenke on my botelere as ze be-hygte me fore ze wyten wel zoure self þat hit ys harme to me þat I am so longe with oute and but ze mow gete þe same man þat ze spoke to me of I prey zow doth zoure bysynesse to gete me anoþer and þat he be lowlyche be any way I pray zow and as I tryste to zow fayle me not I kan no more but I be-take zow god I-wryten at Eytoun þe xxix day of May and al so I pray zow þat ze wyl sende me xix rayes of þis same ray þat þe berer of þis letter schal take zow and as myche clop of colour þer to acordyng & þat ze sende hyt hyder by þe berer of þis letter and þe

<sup>1</sup> Archdeacon of Berkshire (1389), prebendary of Lincoln (1397); trustee of the Earl of Warwick (1397). Betchworth (Surrey) was held by the Arundels; but exactly how Yokeflete or Lady Zouche was connected with it does not appear.

<sup>2</sup> Among the letters is a bond by which Lady Zouche agrees for £24 sterling received of Treygos to pay him 7 marks a year for four years and two quarters, out of the issues of her manor of Stopeham (Sussex) held in dower. To the bond are still attached two tallies showing payments to him.

<sup>3</sup> The words "or two zif it nedith" are interlineated in yellower ink but the same hand.

<sup>4</sup> Between "not" and "at" the words are in a crease of the paper and worn almost to illegibility.

SOME ENGLISH PERSONAL LETTERS OF 1402 261

prys *per with* and *pe* next man goth by twene I schal pay zow be my troupe and al so I pray zow fore my loue *pat* ze wyl sende me ij zerd of *pe* brede *pat* ys marked here  fore a cors of silk fore an horne

Elyzabeth  
lady Zouche

Addressed on the verso :

To my ryzt wel be loued  
frende Joh' Bore

At the bottom, very small, in a different hand and lighter ink :

corps [?] de ce  
a° iij° for a cors of selk

III

[m. 3]

Ryzt wel by loued frend I Grete zow wel. And thonke zow hertelych of *your* grete besynesse the wych that ze han had. And al wey I pray zow that ze wolen holde on. And as towchyng Baldeswych' the lumbard wat hende that frome<sup>1</sup> and ze Makz *with* hym ful and hol I wol stonde *per*to. And as towchyng Bampton the taylour wat hende that ze Make *with* hym in any degre I a-sente fullych *per* to. And as towchyng all other Maters I pray zow that ze wole do as ze thynkz that gode ys and as touchyng the Clotyng and *pe* horn the wych I sente to zow fore I pray zow that ze wole do *your* besynesse that I Myzte haue hyt And as touchyng Hoigkyns comyng to london' I wot neuer wat he doth *per*e But gret wages and gret despenses he axeth for hys beyng there And *per* fore I pray zow that ze wole sende Me word by the berer of *pis* letter yf that he May do zow any ese o<sup>per</sup> profyzt and I schal sende hym *pyder* al redy And elles I haue as lef that he be styлле atom I-wryte at Eytoun the vij day of Jule

E la zouche

I pray zow *pe* nexte tyme that ze speke *with* frome that ze wole grete hym wel and prayzezt hym *pat* he wole be gode frend to me al wey as he hath I-be here by fore.

On the back is the address :

To my wel by loued frend  
Jon Bore

And beneath it, in another hand [his ?] :

vne corps de selk' come dedens est mys a madame par Thom' [*space for a name*] garsoun al dite dame le portour dicest lettere que coste iij s. viij d.

<sup>1</sup> One of her first husband's executors. See Letter IV.

## IV

[m. 4]

Ryzt wel be loued frend I grete zow wel & fayn wolde here of zoure wel fare and I prey zow *pat* ze wyl ordeyne a leyser *pat* frome & ze myzt come hyder to gyder and sete I pray [th]is hous in better gouernawns for I panke god hyt ys euer lenger þe wers and *pat* ze wolde don hyt in hast for I wolde schape me fore to ryde to my lady my moder and al so I wolde a preyde zow *pat* ze wolde haue ordeyned me a peyre bedes of gold fore my lady my moder with ye queyntest pater nosterster [*by error*] *yat* ze kan fynde wat so euer they coste and al so I pray zow *yat* ze wyl ordeyne me a pype of whyte wyn as I spak to zow of al so I pray zow *pat* ze wyl me [*sic*] sende me worde wat prys of an hol cloþ of blak veluet and as my tryst ys in zow fayle me not namelyche of my bedes. I kan no more but I prey god haue zow in hys kepyng I-wryten at Eyton on Seynt gyles euen

E la zouche

On the back is the address :

Tho [?] my wel belouede frende  
Joh' Bore

Beneath is the following memorandum in a different hand :

Ceste lettre est seruy come appiert apres cestassauer etc.

Deliuere est par le dit Joh'n Bore a Thom' Chichelyesman portour diceste lettre le v jour de Sept' lan iij<sup>e</sup>/J pipe de vyn blank que coste xxxv s viij d<sup>1</sup>

Et pur barr [elling ?] dicell' vij d Et pur drawyng' dehors le Seler xij d Et pur cariage del dit pipe parentre le Seler & Smythfeld xij d Et deliuere al dit Thom' pur soun costages viij d

Item Mis est a madame la Souche par le dit portour J peire bedys dore poissant j vnc' & demj vnc'/horspris xl d de pois quels coste en tut xxxviij s

Anno iij<sup>o</sup>

pip' vini

Especially interesting is the purchase of the wine with the incidental processes and expenses. Such scenes must have been watched many times by young Geoffrey Chaucer as they went on in his father's cellars in Thames Street.

It is possible that Lady Zouche's connection with Chaucer's circle was closer than we know, and that she was even known to the poet himself. Besides her kinship with the Arundels and Sir William Beauchamp, some sort of association with other friends of Chaucer may be indicated by a document of 1399. This is a settlement of the manors of Ashenden and Aston Clinton, held by Sir

<sup>1</sup> Stroked through because, as appears below, the viij d was a tip to Thomas.

Philip la Vache, in which the trustees included Sir Thomas Percy, Earl of Worcester, Sir Thomas Clanvowe, and Sir Lewis Clifford, among others, and with them, John Boore, clerk, and Thomas Brooke, clerke.<sup>1</sup> And earlier, in 1390, when Vache himself appointed trustees for certain Oxfordshire manors of John, son and heir of Sir John Beauchamp of Holt, he named among others Sir Lewis Clifford, Sir Richard Abberbury, Sir Richard Stury, and Thomas Broke, clerk.<sup>2</sup> The two records at least suggest association of Lady Zouche with Chaucer's circle.

There is even a chance that she knew Chaucer's work. The fine manuscript of the *Canterbury Tales* now at Corpus Christi College (Oxford) seems to have belonged, according to internal evidence too elaborate to be discussed here, to Sir John Burley, kinsman of the Sir John Burley with whom Chaucer was associated in public affairs, and of the Sir Simon Burley who was tutor to Richard II. And in all probability this manuscript was written between 1400 and 1412. At the date of the Letters, Burley was stepson to Sir Richard Arundel,<sup>3</sup> Lady Zouche's son by her first husband.

But apart from these indications of contact with Chaucer, the Letters are among the very few examples of the familiar epistolary style in English of his time.

<sup>1</sup> CP 25 (1), 290/58/328.

<sup>2</sup> C.C.R., 1388-1392, p. 301.

<sup>3</sup> There are various allusions to him in the Patent and Close Rolls as "the King's knight." He is said to have been noted in tournaments (*Coll. Top. and Gen.* vi, 18). He apparently came of age in 1398, for April 10 of that year he gave a general release to his father's two executors, Robert Scarclyf and John Frome (C.C.R., 1396-1399, p. 298), and May 20 he gave a bond to them for £200, payable at Midsummer (*ibid.* p. 301). Was he the cause of Lady Zouche's appeal in Letter IV to Bore and Frome to come and "set this house in better governance"? He died in 1419.

## THE READING OF AN ELIZABETHAN: SOME SOURCES OF THE PROSE PAMPHLETS OF THOMAS LODGE

By ALICE WALKER

THE career of Thomas Lodge is one that has contributed to form the common conception of the Elizabethan. He carried on the tradition of those mid-century writers—Googe, Churchyard, Whetstone and Gascoigne—whose activities are summarised in Gascoigne's motto "Tam Marti quam Mercurio." Like many other young men of his age, after an education at the University and the Inns of Court, he embarked on the newly created profession of letters and combined a precarious career as a writer with the equally precarious career of Gentleman Adventurer. His work is no less representative of his age than his life. From 1579 to 1596 Lodge was an indefatigable experimenter in nearly all branches of literary activity. Drama (both tragedy and comedy), verse (lyrical, narrative and satiric), novels and prose pamphlets—all these kinds he attempted with varying success. He responded quickly to the quickly-changing fashions of the last two decades of the sixteenth century and his work, by virtue of its experimental nature, touches the literary activity of the period at far more points than that of any contemporary writer. Some of his works were among the most successful literary ventures of their day. In *Rosalynde* and *A Margarite of America* he produced two of the most readable pieces of Elizabethan prose fiction, and in *Wits Miserie*, and *the Worlds Madnesse* one of the best prose pamphlets. Even his less felicitous ventures have a certain historical interest. *Forbonius and Prisceria* (1584) affords an early example of the influence of Byzantine romance on the Elizabethan prose tale. In *The Life of Robert second Duke of Normandy* (1591) and *William Long beard* (1593) Lodge anticipated both Nashe and Deloney in turning to chronicle and history for raw material for the novel. *A Fig for*

Momus (1  
on the cla  
"in that  
written."

Of L

known.

controver

rather th

the *Alar*

apparent

*Catharos*

*Madnesse*

little att

for his

Greene,

and qu

particul

up" in

an adeq

of the

read an

are neg

of inter

Lodge's

of his n

Lod

been f

prose

verse,

have p

on mo

of cou

tricks

witnes

from

of a t

media

—its

boast

as I

*Momus* (1595) contains the first printed Elizabethan verse satires on the classical model as well as epistles which Lodge claimed were "in that kind, wherein no Englishman" had "publicly written."

Of Lodge's writings the prose pamphlets are the least well-known. The Reply to Gosson is of interest as a contribution to the controversy between the Puritans and the stage, and on that account, rather than on its intrinsic merit, has been several times reprinted; the *Alarum against Usurers* has attracted notice on account of its apparent autobiographical interest, but the later pamphlets—*Catharos* (1591), *The Diuel Coniured*, *Wits Miserie*, and *the Worlds Madnesse* and *Prosopopeia*, all published in 1596—have received little attention. Undoubtedly Lodge did not find the best outlet for his talents in this kind of writing. He had not the ease of Greene, nor the vigour and personality of Nashe, nor the humour and quaintness of Dekker, and several of his pamphlets (more particularly *Catharos* and *The Diuel Coniured*) were clearly "yarkt up" in response to no other impulse than the necessity of producing an adequate number of pages for a quarto volume. The absence of the qualities for which the best Elizabethan pamphlets are still read and remembered does not mean, however, that these tracts are negligible historically. They deal for the most part with topics of interest in their day and shed some interesting light both on Lodge's methods of book-production and the range and variety of his reading.

Lodge's habit of unacknowledged translation in his verse has been fully recognised. It has not, however, been noted that his prose pamphlets reveal raids, even more daring than those in his verse, on other works, English and foreign. That Lodge should have put together his pamphlets by "conveying" passages that on more than one occasion cover twenty pages at a stretch is not, of course, unparalleled in Elizabethan literature. It was one of the tricks of the trade resorted to by many of his contemporaries—witness Lyly's borrowings from Cicero and Plutarch, Greene's from La Primaudaye, Nashe's incorporation of practically the whole of a treatise by Pictorius in *Pierce Penilesse*. It was a survival of mediæval habits strengthened by certain tendencies of the renaissance—its study of rhetoric and emphasis on Imitation. Hence Lodge's boast in the prefatory epistle to *A Fig for Momus* "I have so written, as I have read," and at the close of *Wits Miserie*, and *the Worlds*

*Madnesse* he speaks of having "employed" his "readings" as a matter of commendation rather than blame. As the century advanced, however, this reliance on second-hand material became subject to increasing criticism. In poetry slighting comments on plagiarising habits became frequent. Nashe observed that slavish imitation was tolerable in preachers, but that more originality was expected of the man of letters, and Bacon made a claim that had special significance at the time when he wrote "Much in experience, little in books." The convenience of the practice, however, overcame the scruples of most writers and Lodge, even more than the majority of his contemporaries, succumbed to this labour-saving method of book-production.

#### i. CATHAROS. DIOGENES IN HIS SINGULARITIE

This pamphlet was published in 1591 during Lodge's absence on his voyage with Cavendish to South America. It is a moral discourse in dialogue form delivered by Diogenes from his tub to two "Athenian" magistrates, *Cosmosophos* and *Philoplutos*. In the first part of the pamphlet the morals are delivered by means of fables; the second half of the tract consists of long tirades, principally against Usury and Lechery. There is every indication (particularly in the opening pages of *Catharos*) that this pamphlet had for its Elizabethan reader a topical political interest and it is fairly clear that Lodge's contemporaries were meant to recognise under the names of *Cosmosophos* and *Philoplutos* the figures of Walsingham and Burghley. *Cosmosophos* has fairly distinctive marks. He is grey-haired, has been married twice, and the "tempestuous intervals" in his domestic life<sup>1</sup> and the disgrace of Leicester (step-father of Walsingham's son-in-law Essex) seem to be alluded to in Diogenes' gibe—"a filbert is better than a faggot, except it be an *Athenian* she handfull: you know that *Cosmosophos*, euer since your last marriage, how doth the father of your sonne in lawe?" (p. 12).<sup>2</sup> That some topical significance was understood by Lodge's contemporaries is supported by an apparent reference to his pamphlet in the Epistle of T. B. prefixed to *The Second Part of the French Academie* of La Primaudaye (1594). After a tirade against

<sup>1</sup> v. Conyers Read, *Mr. Secretary Walsingham and the Policy of Queen Elizabeth*, Oxford, 1925, vol. iii, pp. 422-23.

<sup>2</sup> All references to Lodge's works are to the Hunterian Club edition, Glasgow 1875-1888.

some writer who is not named but can almost certainly be identified as Greene, he continues :

And if the rest of his crew may be permitted so easily as hee did without controlment to instill their venomous inuentions into the minds of our English youth by meanes of printing, what other thing can wee looke for, but that the whole land should speedily be ouerflown with the deadly waters of all impieties, when as the flood-gates of Atheism are thus set wide open ? Are they not already growen to this boldnes, that they dare to gird at the greatest personages of all estates and callings under the fables of sauage beasts, not sparing the very dead that lie in their graues ? (b4<sup>b</sup>).

The assumption that this reference is to *Catharos* is strengthened by the fact that both Leicester and Walsingham had died before its publication. Philoplutos has less distinctive marks but references to his age—" Husband not for manie Winters, for thou art old " (p. 62)—and to his early rising (p. 9) and Diogenes' warning that the building of " rich Towers " brings less fame than " liberalitie to the learned " (p. 63) seem to point to Burghley.

The topical interest of this pamphlet, however, does not go very far or very deep and probably Lodge intended nothing more by these innuendoes than to gain for his work some *succès de scandale*, for after the opening pages he settled down to the wholesale borrowing of material from other books. The pamphlet is, indeed, with the exception of a few pages at the opening and close, made up of borrowings from two works—*The Dialoges of Creatures Moralyzed* and the *Somme des Pechez* of Jean Benedicti.

The fables, with their moralisations, in the first half of this pamphlet, were all taken, without the slightest acknowledgment, from *The Dialoges of Creatures Moralyzed*, an anonymous collection of fables, very popular, especially in the Low Countries, at the close of the fifteenth and the opening of the sixteenth century. It was first printed at Gouda in 1480 under the title *Dyalogus Creaturarum Optime Moralizatus*, and before the end of the century at least eight Latin, three Dutch and two French editions had appeared. No complete English translation was printed until 1535 when the popularity of the work was clearly on the wane. The Dialogues consist of a hundred and twenty-two fables of animals, birds, fishes, the elements, precious stones and mythological beasts. First comes the fable, then the moral delivered in a couplet and driven home by further illustration, sometimes by another fable,

sometimes by quotations from the scriptures and the fathers, sometimes by an anecdote from late classical or mediæval *exempla*.

Seven of these fables were incorporated in *Catharos*.<sup>1</sup> A comparison of the English translation of 1535 and Lodge's fables makes it clear that it was the English and not a Latin or French text that he was using. The fables in *Catharos* occasionally retain the archaisms in vocabulary and syntax of the 1535 version and the phrasing is at times so close to that of the earlier English translation that it is impossible to explain the coincidence as due to an independent rendering of a Latin or French original. Lodge takes a fair amount of trouble to adapt the fables to his theme. Some he reproduces as they stand, but others are given an Elizabethan colouring. The somewhat vague classical references of the original are rendered with more precision. "A kynge" and the "kynge of Perce" are given their respective names, Midas and Cyrus; "tarcy" is corrected to Tomyris and "appolynde" to Apollo. The most significant changes, however, are in the language. For the most part linguistic archaisms are discarded; "delycis" becomes "deliciousness," "adioynante" "adioining," "venditours" "sellers," "again" "against," "aftir" "according to." Equally interesting is Lodge's syntactical recomposition of these fables as showing a conscious recognition of the development of English prose style in the sixteenth century from "loose and as it were ungyrt" to "strongly trussed up together."

About halfway through *Catharos* Lodge set aside *The Dialoges of Creatures Moralyzed* for another work of a very different character—*La Somme des Pechez et le Remède d'iceux* of a contemporary French Franciscan, Jean Benedicti. The borrowings from this French work cover some thirty pages (roughly one half) of this pamphlet. The tirade against Usury (pp. 32-40), the attack on Lechery (pp. 41-60), and the passage on Envy (pp. 61-62) represent little more than translation from the *Somme des Pechez*. In *Wits Miserie, and the Worlds Madnesse* (p. 48) Lodge acknowledges "Iohn Benedicti" as the authority for an anecdote, but gives no indication of his extensive debt, either in that pamphlet or this, to Benedicti's work.

<sup>1</sup> Lodge also gleaned from *The Dialoges of Creatures Moralyzed* a fair amount of "natural history" of which he made use in *Euphuës Shadow* (1592) and several sayings of the fathers and anecdotes which he utilised in the appended *Deafe Mans Dialogue*.

The  
It was re  
and 1620  
work, ap  
The ma  
quotation  
scriptur  
and La  
there a  
century  
Gaula,  
work o  
des Pe  
deadly  
more i  
attemp  
"we C  
with a  
and of  
haste.  
l'opini  
The h  
rather  
decen

TI  
openi  
under  
subje  
addre  
and a  
may  
since  
soule  
to an  
ever  
to th  
Gen

1  
but I  
the 1

The *Somme des Peches* was first published at Lyons in 1584.<sup>1</sup> It was reprinted at Paris in 1595 and again in 1600, 1601, 1602, 1610 and 1620. The book, which seems to be Benedicti's only published work, appears on the surface to be the work of a man of vast erudition. The margins of its seven hundred folio pages are covered with quotations in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, French and Italian. The scriptures, the fathers and the church councils are quoted, Greek and Latin writers, Italian mediæval and renaissance poets; and there are as well many references to late fifteenth and sixteenth century writings that had achieved notoriety or fame—*Amadis de Gaula*, *La Celestina*, the work of Aretine, the *Heptameron* and the work of Rabelais. The borrowings in *Catharos* from the *Somme des Peches* were all taken from Benedicti's account of the seven deadly sins in the third book of the *Somme*. The material was much more intractable than the fables. Lodge makes a few half-hearted attempts to preserve verisimilitude of time and place by an occasional "we Greeks" or "in Athens," but on the whole he was content with a literal rendering of his original. The translation is slavish and often careless, with errors showing signs of inattention and haste. "Plus cher" is translated "more charily"; "acquiesce à l'opinion," "acquit the opinion"; "la plaie," "the smoke." The last half of *Catharos*, indeed, conveys the impression that Lodge rather wearily continued to translate Benedicti until he could decently wind up his subject.

The last few pages of the pamphlet return to the manner of the opening pages and Philoplutos and Cosmosophos are dismissed under a fire of maxims and proverbs from Diogenes. Several subjects of personal or topical interest are introduced. A plea is addressed to Philoplutos for a more generous patronage of literature, and also for a more adequate reward of the English soldier. Lodge may have had a personal interest in the latter as well as the former, since in the Dedication to *Rosalynde* he describes himself as "a souldier and a scholler," and speaks of having fallen "from bookes to armes." No record of Lodge's having served as a soldier has ever come to light and his military activity may have been confined to the marauding exploits which normally fell to the lot of the Gentleman Adventurer. Whether the passage reflects a personal

<sup>1</sup> Brunet, *Manuel de Libraire*, Paris, 1878. I have seen no copy of this edition, but Brunet's date is confirmed by the Privilege for printing the work which, in the 1595 edition, is dated January 10, 1584.

interest or not it dealt with a topic of considerable interest in the years following the Armada when the mismanagement of the English troops on the continent provoked much criticism. The plea is plentifully illustrated by examples of the esteem enjoyed by the military forces of the great nations of the past drawn from the *Vicissitude des Choses* of the French humanist Louis le Roy, an outline history of civilisation down to the renaissance, first published in 1575. Lodge seems to have made the acquaintance of this work early in his career as a writer, and although he never made any such transcript from it as from *The Dialogues of Creatures Moralyzed* or the *Somme des Peches*, it furnished him with a great deal of miscellaneous information which he made use of in his novels and pamphlets.

## ii. THE DIVEL CONIURED

In *The Divil Coniured* (1596) Lodge again uses the dialogue device. In many respects this tract is a repetition of *Catharos*. The scene is laid "Amidst the inhospitable mountains of Egypt (during the raigne of *Constantine* the renowned and religious Roman Emperor)," where Anthony a "vertuous and solitarie Hermit" delivers to three seekers for knowledge "*Metrodorus* the Tirian," "*Asterius* of Capadocia" and "*Frumentarius* the Indian"<sup>1</sup> discourses on the vanity of the world, devils and magic, free will and comets, counsel and war. The tract reveals in the very diversity of subjects with which it deals traces of a composite origin and was undoubtedly put together in much the same manner as *Catharos*.

One of the principal sources to which Lodge was indebted in this work was the *Flores Theologiarum Quæstionum in Secundum Librum Sententiarum* of a Spanish Franciscan, Joseph Angles. Of Angles little seems to be known beyond the facts that he was a Valentian by birth, was Prefect of his order in Madrid, bishop-designate of Bosa (Sardinia) and the compiler of a similar collection of *Flores . . . in Quartum Librum Sententiarum*. The *Flores . . . in Secundum Librum Sententiarum* was published at Madrid in 1586, at Lyons in 1587, and at Venice in 1588. It is divided into two parts. The first deals with the Creation, Angels, Devils and Magic; the second with Free Will, Grace and Sin. The whole of Anthony's

<sup>1</sup> Lodge's St. Anthony is clearly intended to represent St. Anthony the Great (A.D. 251-356), and his "interlocutors" (with some disregard of chronology) St. Frumentius, St. Asterius and Metrodorus the Greek scientist and grammarian.

discourse  
passages  
Angles' v  
lines or a  
and addi  
method  
Lodge's  
put into  
the "res  
fact that  
title the  
source o  
that the  
have be  
another

For  
source,  
devoted  
of come  
pages (  
source-  
This di  
indirect  
of Meli  
on Alb  
de Me  
Latin  
Dutch  
sixteen  
is know  
the fa  
edition  
Albert  
close  
mater  
rende  
and f  
the po

discourse on devils and magic (pp. 20-41) is a mere translation of passages from the third and fourth sections of the first part of Angles' work. Lodge follows his original closely, omitting a few lines or a passage here and there, but otherwise translating faithfully and adding nothing more than an occasional phrase. The scholastic method of exposition employed by Angles was easily adapted to Lodge's dialogue. The "quæstiones" and "dubitationes" were put into the mouths of Metrodorus, Frumentarius and Asterius, the "responsiones" into the mouth of Anthony. In spite of the fact that Lodge mentions neither the author of this work nor its title there can be no doubt whatsoever that it was the immediate source of this section of *The Diuel Coniured*, since it is most unlikely that the two sections of Angles' work upon which Lodge drew would have been incorporated, between 1586 and 1596, in the work of another writer.

For the following thirty pages of this pamphlet I have found no source, but it is clear that the greater part of this section, which is devoted mainly to a discussion of free will and the nature and influence of comets, was translation from at least two sources. The closing pages (pp. 72-86) are again translation from an unacknowledged source—the *Liber Consolationis et Consilii* of Albertanus of Brescia. This dialogue, written by Albertanus in 1248, had furnished Chaucer, indirectly through the adaptation of Jean de Meung, with *The Tale of Melibeus*. It is quite clear, however, that Lodge drew immediately on Albertanus, since his translation includes passages which Jean de Meung had omitted. There is record of only one edition in Latin of this book (printed at Coni in 1507) before 1600. Several Dutch and German translations were printed in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, but no Italian, French or Spanish translation is known. The frequency with which Lodge quotes in Latin from the fathers and Cato points to his having used either the 1507 edition or some manuscript of this work. Lodge's translation of Albertanus is at times slavish, at times careless. Here, as at the close of *Catharos*, he seems to have taken little pains to present his material in a readable form or even to translate it correctly. The rendering is often too literal to drive home the meaning of the Latin and frequently constructions and cases are misunderstood so that the point of the original is missed altogether.

## iii. WITS MISERIE, AND THE WORLDS MADNESSE

*Wits Miserie, and the Worlds Madnesse* (1596) reveals a much more legitimate method of composition than either *Catharos* or *The Diuel Coniured*. It is, undoubtedly, the most interesting, the most vigorous and the most successful of Lodge's pamphlets. In this work, in which the mediæval classification of the seven deadly sins serves as a framework for satiric pictures of London types in the last decade of the sixteenth century, many literary streams meet, and in his portrayal of the deadly sins Lodge draws not only on the vigorous tradition handed down from mediæval writers but also on newer sources of inspiration—the coney-catching pamphlets of Greene, the "character" and the paradox. The main source of inspiration was, however, Nashe's *Pierce Penilesse* which had appeared four years earlier. There are three references to Nashe in this work and a comparison of the lifeless translation of the passages on Usury and Lechery in *Catharos* and the vigorous descriptions of these sins in *Wits Miserie* shows how much Lodge had learnt from the younger writer. Sandwiched in between passages from the *Somme des Pechez*, packed with learned allusions of every kind, and borrowings, less extensive, from about a dozen other works, are portraits of the seven deadly sins and their branches made vivid by first-hand observation of the life and manners of the time. Throughout the pamphlet there runs a stream of allusions to the most outstanding events of sixteenth-century history (to the struggle between France and Spain for supremacy and the wars in Italy) and to the figures that played a conspicuous part in its making (Charles V, Francis I, Henry of Navarre). There are references to domestic history, political and social (the activity of the Star Chamber in 1596, the unrest caused by enclosures and rackrents and the rise in the standard of living that marked the latter half of the sixteenth century). The seven deadly sins are visualised against a London background—skulking "in the backe Isles" of "Pouls," "in a fray in Fleetstreet," "studying ouer the reuersions of an ordinarie" and sitting "in the Stationers shop. . . . Iibing and flearing ouer euery pamphlet with Ironicall ieasts." There are as well many literary allusions to popular works and writers of the day (*Palmerin*, the ballad of Mistress Saunders, the work of Aretine, Macchiavelli, Bandello, Rabelais) and to Lodge's own contemporaries (Lyly, Spenser, Daniel and Drayton).

This  
activities  
accounts  
rest com  
mediæval  
in a very

The  
of Bene  
Nashe, t  
account  
Lodge's  
only sli  
framew  
Lodge  
pages.  
three of

This  
dozen  
others  
many s

Am  
The fu  
pene D  
studyin  
This c  
Seneca  
and w  
centur  
compi  
as he  
quotat  
Doctor  
four a

TH  
from  
ravan  
Miran  
were t  
the t  
reprin

This part of *Wits Miserie*, which reflects the interests and activities of London life in the last decade of the sixteenth century, accounts, however, for only about one half of the pamphlet. The rest consists of bookish material derived from many sources, mediæval and renaissance, English and foreign, dovetailed together in a very skilful way.

The chief source of the pamphlet was the *Somme des Pechez* of Benedicti. The idea and inspiration for the work came from Nashe, the framework and a great deal of the material from Benedicti's account of the seven deadly sins in the third book of the *Somme*. Lodge's classification of the sins and their branches is based (with only slight modifications) on Benedicti's. Besides furnishing the framework of the pamphlet, the *Somme des Pechez* also provided Lodge with passages ranging in length from a few lines to a few pages. In all, these passages from Benedicti cover about twenty-three of the hundred and seventeen pages of the pamphlet.

This material was supplemented by borrowings from about a dozen other sources, some of which are unacknowledged, while others Lodge mentions in the text or marginal notes among his many second-hand references.

Among the auxiliary sources were three books of commonplaces. The first of these was the *Manipulus Florum* or *Flores Omnium pene Doctorum* of Thomas Palmer, an Irishman by birth who, after studying at Paris, died in a Franciscan convent at Aquila, c. 1289. This collection of commonplaces (mainly from the fathers and Seneca) is of interest as one of the earliest compilations of its kind and was fairly frequently printed in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Although Lodge mentions neither the title nor the compiler of this work it seems fairly clear that it was at his elbow as he compiled this pamphlet. In all about twenty of Lodge's quotations from the fathers and Seneca can be found in the *Flores Doctorum*. Generally the "flores" appear in batches of three or four and in the order in which Palmer arranged them.

The second book of commonplaces was a collection of "flores" from the Latin poets and dramatists compiled by Octaviano Fioravanti (generally known, from his birth-place, as Octaviano Mirandula), an Augustinian canon of the Lateran, whose "flores" were first published in the early years of the sixteenth century under the title *Viridarium Illustrium Poetarum*, and later frequently reprinted as the *Illustrium Poetarum Flores*. In its original form the

work consisted of selections from the Latin poets and dramatists arranged under their authors, but later it was amplified and rearranged as a collection of commonplaces. The book was clearly very popular and seems to have been a standard work of its kind in the sixteenth century. In spite of the fact that Lodge mentions neither the title of this work nor its compiler there can be no doubt that he was acquainted with it. There are in all forty-one verse quotations in this pamphlet. Of these, eight were embedded in passages translated from the *Somme des Pechez*, and of the rest all but one are to be found in Mirandula. Lodge seems to have made the acquaintance of this work early in his career. All the Latin verse quotations in the Reply to Gosson are to be found here: three in the *Alarum*, eight in *Rosalynde*, one in *The Life of Robert second Duke of Normandy*, and one in *William Long beard*, two in *Catharos*, one in *A Margarite of America*, and three in *The Diuel Coniured*. All, in fact, of the quotations in Lodge's works from the less well-known Latin poets, and many of the lines quoted from Virgil, Horace and Ovid seem to have been taken from this collection of commonplaces.

The third book of commonplaces was a collection of "sentences," principally from Cicero, put together by a Frenchman of Toulouse, Pierre Lagnier or Petrus Lagnerius, and first published about 1541. The work was fairly frequently reprinted and augmented during the sixteenth century. All the quotations from Cicero in this pamphlet not taken over with other material from Benedicti are to be found in the *Ciceronis Sententiae* of Lagnerius. As in the case of the *Illustrium Poetarum Flores* of Mirandula, Lodge seems to have made an early acquaintance with this work since the majority of the quotations from Cicero in his writings seem to have been derived from Lagnerius.

Among the acknowledged sources of this pamphlet were three mediæval works. The first of these was a thirteenth-century moral treatise, *De Oculo Morali*. This work, which was very popular in its day, as the number of extant manuscripts shows, and was printed at least five times at the close of the fifteenth and opening of the sixteenth century, has been attributed to some of the best-known theologians of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries—Jean de Galles, Pierre de Limoges, Raimund Jordan and John Peckham. The first two printed editions of this work (Augsburg, c. 1475) attribute it to Johannes Pithsanius (*i.e.* John Peckham, Archbishop

of Canter  
Latin, the  
1496, des  
claims as  
compiler  
1306. Lo  
(p. 112)  
slothful  
the "P.  
acknowle  
two more

The  
though i  
Praellecti  
theologia  
to Holke  
acknowle  
from this  
is difficu  
from th  
but it is  
extracts  
any inte  
British  
publish  
sixteenth  
ten year  
sins Lo  
and tra  
Sometim  
they ex

The  
of Alb  
acknow  
slight a  
The D  
as no p  
transla  
that if

of Canterbury, who died in 1292). Two later editions, the one in Latin, the other an Italian translation, both published at Venice in 1496, describe it as the work of "P. Lacediera" whom Hauréau<sup>1</sup> claims as its author and identifies with Pierre de Limoges, the compiler of three well-known collections of sermons, who died in 1306. Lodge's reference to "an old dunce called Petrus de Lapiaria" (p. 112) as the authority for his story of the king and his three slothful sons is therefore an error, on his part or the printer's, for the "P. Lacediera" of the two Venice editions. Besides this one acknowledged borrowing Lodge also incorporated in *Wits Miserie* two more anecdotes from the *De Oculo Morali*.

The second mediæval work to which Lodge acknowledged, though inadequately, his indebtedness was the *In Librum Sapientiae Praelectiones* of Robert Holkot, one of the best known English theologians of the first half of the fourteenth century. Lodge refers to Holkot in the text and in a marginal note (p. 25), but, as usual, the acknowledged debt gives no indication of his extensive borrowings from this writer. That Lodge borrowed from Holkot at first-hand is difficult to prove conclusively. It is possible that his material from this source reached him through some intermediate work, but it is on the whole unlikely that he would have found the long extracts (in one case three pages of his pamphlet) transcribed in any intermediate work and the original was quite accessible. The British Museum alone possesses copies of five editions of this work published before 1500, and three editions printed during the sixteenth century, the last of which had appeared in 1586, only ten years before *Wits Miserie*. As he dealt with each of the deadly sins Lodge seems to have made a practice of turning to Holkot and translating one or more pertinent passages from his work. Sometimes the passages consist of only a few lines, at other times they extend to two or three pages.

The third mediæval work was the *De Amore et Delectatione Dei* of Albertanus of Brescia. The borrowings, on two occasions acknowledged as from Albertanus (pp. 9 and 67), are, however, slight as compared with Lodge's far greater debt to this writer in *The Diuel Coniured*. These borrowings are of interest, however, as no printed version of this work, either in the original Latin or translation, is recorded until the seventeenth century and it is clear that if these references indicate a first-hand acquaintance with the

<sup>1</sup> v. *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, Paris, 1873, vol. xxvi, pp. 460-67.

*De Amore et Delectatione Dei* Lodge must have known the work in manuscript.

The rest of the works which contributed to *Wits Miserie* were of a more secular and more modern character, some French, others Italian. Among the latter were two works which belonged to a type of literature very popular at the renaissance, the *Nuova Seconda Selva* of Gieronimo Giglio and the *Specchio di Scientia Universale* of Leonardo Fioravanti. Lodge's acquaintance with the former was first noted by Koeppel,<sup>1</sup> who pointed out that the "most pleasant and prettie histories" appended to *William Long beard* were translated from this source. In addition to the borrowings noted by Koeppel, Lodge translated from the *Nuova Seconda Selva* five fairly long passages which he incorporated in *A Margarite of America*, wrote up material from one of its chapters in the second eclogue of *A Fig for Momus*, and borrowed about half a dozen passages, averaging in length about half a page, in *Wits Miserie*.

To the second of these works, the *Specchio di Scientia Universale* of a Bolognese doctor, Leonardo Fioravanti, Lodge's debt was far less extensive. It is quite clear that he had little opinion of Fioravanti, either in his medical or literary capacity, since *Wits Miserie* contains two slighting references to his work (pp. 15 and 19) and his debt to Fioravanti is confined to two passages of "examples" gleaned from the *Specchio*.

There are also in this pamphlet about half a dozen short extracts taken (in two cases with acknowledgment) from the *Discorsi* of Macchiavelli.

This tract also bears witness to Lodge's reading of contemporary French works. Among these was the first part of the *Serées* of Guillaume Bouchet, which furnished about a page and a half of Lodge's description of "Dulnesse of Spirit" (pp. 86-87), and a few short passages and allusions. Lodge had previously made use of the *Serées* in *A Fig for Momus*, where the sixth epistle, "In praise of his Mistres dogge," is nothing more than a stringing together of extracts from Bouchet's *serée* "Du Chien." A passage trans-

<sup>1</sup> Koeppel, *Studien zur Geschichte der italienischen Novelle*, Strassburg, 1892, pp. 68-70. Koeppel's observations, however, seem to have been generally misunderstood. Giglio's *Selva* (first published in 1565) was a continuation and not, as has been frequently stated, a translation of the *Silva de Varia Lección* of Pedro Mexia. It does not seem to have been noted that the opening books of Du Verdier's *Diverses Leçons* represent little more than translation from Giglio's *Selva*.

lated from  
debt to

There  
Erasmus  
the Paral

It is c  
able pair  
been writ  
represent  
in his de  
in which  
dovetail  
of about  
two lines  
then fo  
from the  
Trismeg  
Oculo M  
and the  
(from H  
Not one  
full we  
writers-

The  
able lig  
method  
writing  
elemen  
another  
most p  
than li  
these p  
Lodge  
subject  
work o  
of Albe  
books  
Poetar  
books  
Specch

lated from the *Sepmaine* of Du Bartas (p. 76) concludes Lodge's debt to French writers.

There are as well in this pamphlet several tags from the *Adagia* of Erasmus and fairly frequent borrowings, probably at first-hand, from the Parallel Lives of Plutarch and the Lives of Diogenes Laertius.

It is quite clear from this list of sources that Lodge took considerable pains in the compilation of this work. *Wits Miserie* must have been written with a small library at his elbow, and many of its pages represent a particularly elaborate mosaic of borrowings. A passage in his description of Ingratitude (pp. 21-23) is typical of the manner in which Lodge turned first to one source and then another and dovetailed together his borrowings. First he translates a passage of about twelve lines (from the *Somme des Pechez*); then follow two lines from Plautus and a line from Juvenal (both from Mirandula); then follow quotations from St. Bernard, Pliny and Seneca (all from the *Flores Doctorum* of Palmer); then a quotation from Hermes Trismegistus (from Holkot), followed by a fable (from the *De Oculo Morali*); then a reference to the well-known story of Androcles and the lion, followed by an anecdote from Seneca's *De Beneficiis* (from Holkot) and a phrase from Seneca's *Œdipus* (from Mirandula). Not one of these immediate sources is acknowledged, but throughout full weight is given to the authority of the fathers and classical writers—Plautus, Juvenal, St. Bernard, Pliny, Seneca, etc.

The study of the sources of these pamphlets thus sheds considerable light on Elizabethan methods of book-making and on Lodge's methods of compilation. Sometimes, as in *Wits Miserie*, when writing under sufficient stimulus to fuse together the different elements of which his work was composed, Lodge might say with another great borrower, "I do *concoquere quod hausi*," but for the most part in these pamphlets he was content with what is little more than lifeless translation of other works. A study of the sources of these pamphlets also throws considerable light on the character of Lodge's reading. A very wide range of work, both in date and subject-matter, went to their making: Theological writings (the work of Holkot, Angles and Benedicti), didactic works (the work of Albertanus, *De Oculo Morali*, *The Dialoges of Creatures Morallysed*), books of commonplaces (the *Flores Doctorum* of Palmer, the *Illustrium Poetarum Flores* of Mirandula, the *Sententiae Ciceronis* of Lagnerius), books of the *Silva* variety (the *Nuova Seconda Selva* of Giglio, the *Specchio* of Fioravanti), history and historical commentary (the

*Discorsi* of Macchiavelli, the *Vicissitude des Choses* of Le Roy), contemporary poetry (the *Semaine* of Du Bartas) and recreative literature (the *Serées* of Bouchet). Some further facts concerning Lodge's reading can be gained from his novels and verse. Two mediæval romances (the *Tale of Gamelyn* and *Robert the Devil*), two chronicles (Fabyan's<sup>1</sup> and the *Croniques de Normendie*<sup>2</sup>), and another collection of commonplaces (the *Concetti* of Garimbert<sup>3</sup>) contributed to Lodge's prose tales, while his lyrical verse shows an acquaintance with the work of French and Italian lyric poets (Ronsard, Desportes, Paschale, Martelli, Celiano), and probably one or more anthologies of Italian verse. Some of the works Lodge read are still read to-day; others are known only to the book-collector and the student of the byways of mediæval and renaissance literature.

From this study of Lodge's reading several interesting facts emerge. In the first place the number of mediæval works with which Lodge was acquainted is remarkable. Work of the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was represented in Lodge's library; of the thirteenth: the work of Albertanus, the *Flores Doctorum*, *De Oculo Morali* and the *Croniques de Normendie*; of the fourteenth: the work of Holkot and the *Tale of Gamelyn*; of the fifteenth: the *Dialoges of Creatures Moralsed*. Some of these had been fairly frequently reprinted in the sixteenth century, but others Lodge must have known in fifteenth or early sixteenth century editions. One of these works at least—the *Tale of Gamelyn*—Lodge must have seen in manuscript,<sup>4</sup> and it is possible that the work of Albertanus<sup>5</sup> and the *Croniques de Normendie*<sup>6</sup> were also known to Lodge in manuscript form.

<sup>1</sup> *William Long beard* is based on the story of William Fitzosbert, a popular demagogue of the reign of Richard I, who ended his career at Tyburn in 1196. Lodge's source was undoubtedly Fabyan's chronicle, since he not only borrows from Fabyan the names of three characters in his story (Peter Nowlay, Robert Besaunt and Gerald de Antiloche) but also follows Fabyan in giving the date of the disturbances caused by Longbeard wrongly as 1197.

<sup>2</sup> This anonymous French chronicle, dating in the first place from the second half of the thirteenth century, was, as the late Dr. Breul pointed out (*Sir Gonthier, Oppeln*, 1886, p. 63), the main source of *The Life of Robert second Duke of Normandy*, although it is apparent that Lodge knew as well at least the outlines of the mediæval romance.

<sup>3</sup> An Italian collection of commonplaces (derived largely from the *Sententiae* of Stobæus) compiled by Girolamo Garimberto and first published in 1551. Lodge twice quotes "Garimbert" in *Euphues Shadow* and made extensive use of his commonplaces both in *Euphues Shadow* and the appended *Deafe Mans Dialogue*.

<sup>4</sup> The *Tale of Gamelyn* was first printed in Urry's *Chaucer*, 1721.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *supra*, pp. 275-6.

<sup>6</sup> The *Croniques de Normendie* was printed at least eight times between 1487 and 1591. Lodge's material corresponds more closely with that of the early

In th  
analytica  
would sh  
nearly s  
full valu  
Rome,  
unackno  
classics  
debt to  
and the  
Seneca  
and Ho  
but ap  
classics  
Plutar  
indica  
writer  
had b

TH  
to ligh  
The  
of the  
Angle  
supp  
ledge  
is str  
1591  
supp  
Cou  
editio  
of ap  
that  
manu  
1  
Sen  
pp.  
shor  
pp.  
Ep.  
pp.  
Ha

In the second place the study of Lodge's sources shows, as an analytical study of most Elizabethan works of a similar character would show, that Lodge's reading of the work of antiquity was not nearly so extensive as would appear from his references, in which full value is given to anything that bore the hall-mark of Greece or Rome, while greater debts to more modern writers are passed by unacknowledged. Evidence of a first-hand knowledge of the classics is rare in Lodge's works. The Reply to Gosson reveals a debt to Cicero's *Pro Archia*.<sup>1</sup> About 1591, when *Euphues Shadow* and the *Deafe Mans Dialogue* were written, Lodge had been reading Seneca.<sup>2</sup> The satires in *A Fig for Momus* were modelled on Juvenal and Horace,<sup>3</sup> and the *Wounds of Civill War* was based on Appian,<sup>4</sup> but apart from these slight traces of the reading of classical and late classical writers and evidence of a first-hand acquaintance with Plutarch's *Lives* and the *Lives of Diogenes Laertius*, there is no indication that Lodge's knowledge of classical and late classical writers extended beyond the range of those works to which he had been introduced in his school and college days.

The third point which a consideration of these sources brings to light is the number of theological writings which Lodge possessed. The majority of these were the works of contemporary exponents of the Catholic faith and in view of Lodge's reading of the work of Angles, Benedicti and Luis de Granada,<sup>5</sup> it seems reasonable to suppose that his conversion to Roman Catholicism (openly acknowledged later in his life) had begun at least as early as 1591. The view is strengthened by the fact that the majority of Lodge's works after 1591 were dedicated to patrons who were recognised or suspected as supporters of the old faith—the Countess of Shrewsbury, the Countess of Derby, William, Earl of Derby, the Countess of

editions than with that of the later, but there is in his romance a certain amount of apparently historical material not found in any printed version of the *Croniques* that may go back on some manuscript of the work. Between thirty and forty manuscripts of the *Croniques* are still in existence.

<sup>1</sup> Cf., especially, Reply to Gosson, pp. 10-12, and *Pro Archia*, 8-10.

<sup>2</sup> Philamis' letter of consolation to Harpaste seems to have been written with Seneca's *Ad Marciam de Consolatione* in mind. Cf., especially, *Euphues Shadow*, pp. 49-50 and *Ad Marciam*, xx, 1-2. The *Deafe Mans Dialogue* contains three short passages translated from Seneca's Letters. Cf. *Deafe Mans Dialogue*, pp. 87-88, and Seneca, *Ep.* lxxxviii, 4-14; and *Deafe Mans Dialogue*, p. 91, and *Ep.* lxxvi, 8-9.

<sup>3</sup> v. R. M. Alden, *The Rise of Formal Satire in England*, Philadelphia, 1899, pp. 90-97.

<sup>4</sup> v. N. Burton Paradise, *Thomas Lodge, The History of an Elizabethan*, New Haven and London, 1931, pp. 137-139.

<sup>5</sup> v. *post*, p. 281.

Cumberland and the Hare family. Possibly the seeds of Lodge's religious beliefs were sown when, as a child, he was placed in the household of the Earl of Derby,<sup>1</sup> and it is quite likely that some of the difficulties of Lodge's early life were due to his religion.

The examination of the sources of these pamphlets also provides the necessary data for the solution of the problem of the authorship of the tract *Prosopopeia*. In 1845, in the publications of the Shakespeare Society, Collier<sup>2</sup> drew attention to this pamphlet and gave reasons for believing it to be the work of Lodge. On the title-page of this work no author's name is mentioned, but the Dedication and Epistle of one of the three surviving copies—that in Lambeth Palace—are signed T.L. In the two other existing copies—in the Bodleian and Edinburgh University Libraries—the initials appear as L.T. Laing contested the ascription of the work to Lodge<sup>3</sup> and on the strength of the initials L.T. suggested Lawrence Twyne as its author. The Hunterian Club evidently considered Lodge's authorship probable enough to justify its inclusion in their reprint of Lodge's works.

The book, sub-titled "The Teares of the holy, blessed and sanctified Marie, the Mother of GOD," is an exercise in devotional meditation. In the Epistle to the readers its writer expresses repentance for the "foule forepassed progenie" of his thoughts "begotten in the night of" his "error," but the penitent mood cannot be taken too personally since the tract was a contribution to a mediæval *genre* which continued to flourish at the renaissance, and whatever personal feeling may have inspired the work it certainly was not strong enough to fuse together the various literary elements of which it was composed. The work opens in a passionate and somewhat lyrical style (to which the writer draws attention in his Epistle) but sinks at intervals to uninspired and tedious allegory of a marked mediæval character.

There can be no doubt that *Prosopopeia* was the work of Lodge since it contains translation from three works from which he had taken material in his other pamphlets—the *De Oculo Morali*, the *In Librum Sapientie Praelectiones* of Holkot and the *Somme des Pechez* of Benedicti. The borrowings from these three works provide incontestable proof of Lodge's authorship. The main sources of

<sup>1</sup> v. *A Fig for Momus*, p. 4.

<sup>2</sup> *Shakespeare Society's Papers*, vol. 2, London, 1845, pp. 156-59.

<sup>3</sup> *Lodge's Defence of Poetry Music and Stage Plays*, ed. Laing, Shakespeare Society, London, 1853, pp. xlv-xlvi.

inspirati  
well-kno  
de la Or  
About a  
pages ar  
style wh  
pamphle  
acknowl  
indicate  
Lodge's  
writing  
since it  
Jesuit c

<sup>1</sup> Lo  
Gramate  
since the  
translati

inspiration for this pamphlet were, however, two works of the well-known Spanish Dominican writer, Luis de Granada—*El Libro de la Oración y Meditación* and the *Memorial de la Vida Cristiana*. About a dozen passages ranging in length from a few lines to two pages are translated from these works and the declamatory, oratorical style which Lodge maintained throughout the greater part of this pamphlet was undoubtedly inspired by Granada. Two marginal acknowledgments of indebtedness to Granada (pp. 24 and 29) indicate that Lodge knew these works in a Latin translation. Lodge's acquaintance with contemporary Spanish theological writings—the work of Granada<sup>1</sup> and of Angles—is interesting since it suggests that these books formed part of the spoils of the Jesuit college at Santos.

<sup>1</sup> Lodge must also have possessed a copy of Michael ab Isselt's *Flores Lodovici Granatensis* (a compilation from the *Guía de Pecadores*, first published in 1588) since there can be no doubt that *The Flowers of Lodowicke of Granado* (1601), a translation of the first part of Isselt's *Flores*, was the work of Lodge.

## THE MS. OF SACKVILLE'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE *MIRROR FOR MAGISTRATES*

By MARGUERITE HEARSEY

IT will be of interest to students of Elizabethan literature to know that in the library of St. John's College, Cambridge, is to be found the original manuscript of the contribution of Thomas Sackville to the *Mirror for Magistrates*. This manuscript seems to have been unknown until the present time to students of literary history.

Mr. Robin Flower, Deputy Keeper of Manuscripts of the British Museum, calls it one of the most interesting author's manuscripts of the period that he has ever had to deal with.<sup>1</sup> It contains some fourteen hundred lines, about one hundred of which, so far as I know, are here printed in full for the first time. Some of the manuscript is in the Italic and some in the Secretary hand, and there are many variations within the Secretary. This is, of course, not surprising, for the manuscript is long, and toward the end especially is evidently a first draft, in which the very process of composition is reflected. The leaves are bound in copy-book fashion, and on the outside is written in the author's hand, *The Complaint of Henry Duke of Buckingham*. Within, on the next page, there is written in smaller letters, *The Complaint of Henrie, Duke of Buckinghame made by T. S.* The *S* is superimposed on the *T* to make a monogram. After three blank pages, the poem begins with the stanzas which have always been entitled, in print, *The Induction*. There are seventy-nine of these stanzas; then with the eightieth begins the portion which has always been printed separately as *The Complaint*. This portion of the poem contains 113 stanzas, making altogether a total of 192, one more than the total of the printed versions of *The Induction* and

<sup>1</sup> I am greatly indebted to Mr. Flower, who kindly examined the manuscript for me, for his expert judgment, which led him to the decision that the manuscript "is throughout in the handwriting of Sackville, despite curious variations in the script."

*The Complaint*.<sup>1</sup> Following the last stanza of *The Complaint* the word *finis* appears. Up to this point the manuscript is for the most part carefully and beautifully written, in the Secretary hand, though there are a good many interlinear corrections, obviously of the author's making. The marginal notes and a few of the interlinear corrections are in the Italic hand. On the four pages following the close of *The Complaint* there occur the lines that have never before been printed. Most of this portion of the manuscript is in the Italic hand, but some words and lines are in the Secretary. There are nine fairly complete rhyme royal stanzas, and a number of disconnected words and phrases.

Taken as a whole, this manuscript throws light on several matters that have to do with the history of the *Mirror for Magistrates* and with Thomas Sackville's own history, but before turning to these one example might be given from the corrections in the body of the manuscript to illustrate Sackville's concern for his poetic diction. The word *hugie*, for which he seems to have started a vogue, apparently pleased and haunted him. In stanza 26, line 5, one finds "This shalt thou se but grete is the unrest." Here *hugie* was written first but crossed out in favour of *grete*, which is written above the line. In the following stanza (l. 7) the manuscript reads: "Unto the place wher is this hugie plain." Here *wofull* was written first but crossed out in favour of *hugie*. In stanza 27, line 3, the manuscript reads "Er I was ware into a mightie wood." Here *hugie* has been crossed out and *mightie* written in between the lines. It is pertinent to note that the word *hugie* is used at least five times in Act v of *Gorboduc*! <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The extra stanza occurs in the manuscript between the 18th and 19th stanzas of *The Complaint of Henry Duke of Buckingham*, as printed in Haselwood's edition of the *Mirror*. It reads as follows:

"This worde murder so hidouslie soundes  
And with soche poyson dothe infest the ayer  
That oft alas I fele it how it woundes  
My brest when it dothe in my mought repaire  
And with soche dolor drouneth in despaire  
My venomd harte, that but for wearied might  
I hyde my face before thalmighties sight."

<sup>2</sup> The first use of the word recorded in the Oxford Dictionary is Lydgate's in the *Assembly of Gods*. Sackville may have got the word from Lydgate. Jasper Heywood uses it in his preface to *Troas* (ed. H. de Vocht, "Materialien zur Kunde des alteren Englischen Dramas," Band xli, Louvain, 1913, p. 9). Although *Troas* was printed before Sackville's poem, I believe that the *Mirror* poem was written first, and that Heywood may have seen it in manuscript and taken the word from Sackville. The use of the word by later Elizabethan authors can probably be attributed to the influence of Sackville.

The importance of the *Mirror for Magistrates* in the history of Elizabethan literature has been variously appreciated by literary historians; but it is safe to say that the work as a whole has never been over-estimated. All critics are agreed, however, in judging Thomas Sackville's contribution to be the best poetry in the vast collection.

I have little hesitation in saying that no more astonishing contribution to English poetry, when the due reservations of that historical criticism which is the life of all critics are made, is to be found anywhere. . . . The poetical value of the whole is extraordinary. . . . The cadences of the verse are perfect, the imagery fresh and sharp, the presentation of nature singularly original. . . . His (Sackville's) contributions to the *Mirror for Magistrates* contain the best poetry written in the English language between Chaucer and Spenser, and are most certainly the models of some of Spenser's finest work.<sup>1</sup>

Such is Saintsbury's criticism of Sackville's poetry, and, with some modifications, this is the opinion of most critics. But there are two other matters that are usually discussed by commentators on the *Mirror*—the part that Sackville played in the origin and development of the whole plan, and the fact that, except for *Gorboduc*, Sackville did practically no other literary work.

Some critics, following Warton perhaps, assume that Sackville was "the primary inventor" of the *Mirror*; and almost all have inferred, judging from his subsequent career, that early and important political responsibilities drew him away from literature and led him to a life dedicated to the service of the Queen rather than the Muses. The Sackville manuscript which has been described presents interesting evidence on these two matters. It proves the first assumption to be unwarranted and corroborates the second, recording it may be, the very moment of Sackville's turning from literature to politics.

Misapprehension about Sackville's part in the origin and development of the *Mirror* seems to have arisen from the following words in the prose link preceding the *Induction* in the 1563 edition (the edition in which Sackville's work first appeared, though the *Mirror* had come out in 1559).

"I haue here the duke of Buckingham, king Richard's chiefe instrument, written by maister Thomas Sackuille." "Read it we pray you," said

<sup>1</sup> George Saintsbury, *A History of Elizabethan Literature*, London, 1887, pp. 11-12.

they. " or Induct thereby the cause that some in such haue got Buckingham from that determin as Lydgate meete in iudgment out of doing, thus."

Then The In the titl Ric Mirror preced of the compl Baldwin a littl Mirror Baldwin time editio " con with he c App traged Rich Sack he p that

they. "With a good will," quoth I, "but first you shall heare his Preface or Induction." "Hath hee made a preface," sayd one, "what meaneth hee thereby, seeing none other hath vsed the like order?" "I will tell you the cause thereof," sayd I, which is this: after that hee vnderstoode that some of the counsayl would not suffer the booke to bee printed in such order as wee had agreeede and determined, hee purposed to haue gotten at my handes all the tragedies that were before the duke of Buckingham's which hee would haue preserued in one volume. And from that time backward, euen to the time of William the Conqueror, he determined to continue and perfect all the story him selfe, in such order as Lydgate (following Bochas) had already vsed. And therefore to make a meete induction into the matter, hee deuised this poesie: which (in my iudgment) is so well penned that I would not haue any verse thereof left out of our volume. Now that you knowe the cause and meaning of his doing, you shall also heare what hee hath done. His induction beginneth thus."<sup>1</sup>

Then follow, in the 1563 edition, the seventy-nine stanzas called *The Induction*, and immediately after these, 112 more stanzas, under the title *The Complaint of Henry, Duke of Buckingham*.

Richard Niccols, who brought out a cumulative edition of the *Mirror* in 1610, removed *The Induction* from its place immediately preceding the *Complaint of Henry Duke of Buckingham*, to the front of the book, to stand as an "induction" or introduction to the complete set of tragedies. Perhaps he was justified in so doing from Baldwin's words in the passage quoted. Baldwin's explanation is a little obscure, but taken in the light of the early history of the *Mirror*, it may reasonably be interpreted as follows: When William Baldwin, the first editor of the *Mirror*, approached Sackville, sometime between the suppression of what was to have been the 1554 edition and the publication of the 1559 edition (no allusion to the "counsail" would have been pertinent except for those years) with the request that he make some contribution to the collection, he explained the difficulties that the editors had encountered. Apparently the authorities had disapproved of the publication of tragedies dealing with figures so recent as those from the time of Richard on, which was the order first planned. The interest of Sackville was aroused and his imagination kindled to the extent that he proposed to collect all the tragedies that had been written up to that time, and arrange them in proper sequence, supplying himself

<sup>1</sup> *The Mirror for Magistrates*, ed. Joseph Haselwood, London, 1815, vol. 2, pp. 307-08.

all the tragedies necessary to complete the history from the time of the Duke of Buckingham backward to the time of William the Conqueror. Evidently he did not have enough of this work done to print in 1559 when the *Mirror* went to press. Not until the edition of 1563 did anything from his pen appear, and then it consisted of only one "tragedy," the *Complaint of Henry Duke of Buckingham*, with the stanzas called *The Induction* printed immediately preceding this *Complaint*. This arrangement, considered in the light of Baldwin's words, might well have given rise to the belief that Sackville wrote an introduction for the whole series of poems. The evidence now available, however, in Sackville's own manuscript, proves that Sackville wrote only one poem, and that this was arbitrarily printed as two by the editors of the *Mirror*. There is clearly no ground for believing that Sackville conceived the whole plan.

But the conjectures about Sackville's having abandoned literature for politics the manuscript interestingly substantiates. In fact, we seem to find in the manuscript a record of what may well be the very instant in which Fate decreed that Sackville should become Lord Buckhurst, Knight of the Garter, Chancellor of Oxford, Lord High Treasurer of England, Earl of Dorset, one of the most trusted and most fortunate of Elizabeth's councillors and statesmen, rather than, let us say, an "ur-Spenser," the creator of some other *Faerie Queene*, struggling to win from that very practical Tudor sovereign a pittance of appreciation and recognition for his loyal but quite impractical services. At the very end of the manuscript, in a hasty hand, and apparently as a reminder by the author to himself, we find the words, "Remember Master Burden's promise for the showing of Seneca's chorus (?)<sup>1</sup> touching the captation of auram popularem."

For an understanding of this note we must turn, I believe, to the years 1558 and 1559. No matter caused the early parliaments of Elizabeth's reign more anxiety than the settlement of the succession. Various methods were taken to impress upon the Queen the seriousness of the situation. Thomas Norton was a member of a committee of the House of Commons appointed to consider the question. Thomas Sackville was a member of these early parliaments, and because of this, as well as his relationship to the queen (he was a

<sup>1</sup> "Seneca's chorus," to which Sackville alludes, may be the one in *Octavia*, ll. 877 ff.

cousin of  
concern  
for mater  
story of  
concern  
translati  
Senecan  
interrupt  
writing,  
tragedy,  
The lin  
Burden  
captatio  
the sow  
through  
poems.  
was at  
that wo  
afield t

Asi  
manus  
unprin  
The al  
we re  
the p  
Mise  
The  
to wh  
T  
follow

1  
Smi  
Wat  
and

cousin of Anne Boleyn's), if for no other reasons, would have been concerned with the problem. In scanning the pages of the chronicles for material for his *Mirror* poems, he probably had come upon the story of *Gorboduc*, and its applicability to the contemporary political concern impressed him. Moreover, in 1559 Jasper Heywood's translation of *Troas* appeared—the first English translation of a Senecan play. The coincidence of these circumstances, I believe, interrupted Sackville's work on the *Mirror* and led him to the writing, in collaboration with Norton, of "the first regular English tragedy," and ultimately to the abandoning of a literary career. The lines at the end of the manuscript—"Remember Master Burden's promise for the showing of Seneca's chorus (?) touching the captation of auram popularem"—may suggest the very moment of the sowing of the seed for *Gorboduc*, the "catching of public favor" through a Senecan play, on a theme found in reading for the *Mirror* poems. And so it would appear that Sackville's work on the *Mirror* was at least a contributory factor in his share of *Gorboduc*, and that that work, perhaps because of its propagandist nature, led him so far afield that he never returned to literature.<sup>1</sup>

Aside from the historical matters on which the Sackville manuscript throws some light, we have in the portion hitherto unprinted, some indication of Sackville's literary interests and taste. The allusions to Wyatt and Surrey assume especial significance when we recall that they were probably made almost immediately after the publication of the poems of Wyatt and Surrey in *Tottel's Miscellany*, and that they were made by a poet of Sackville's ability. The comments on Chaucer add Sackville to the long list of those to whom Chaucer is "maister dere and fadir reverent."

The hitherto unpublished material in the Sackville manuscript follows:

Be this phaeton whirled within his cart  
made all the Orient blushe at his vprise  
and with a lashe that gave a fieri smart  
whipt furth his stedes which now so fast them hies  
that from their nostrelles sparkes of flame out flies  
the faier and hevenlie light vnfoldng then  
with thousand cares to selie mortal men

<sup>1</sup> For discussion of the political significance of *Gorboduc*, see Lucy Toulmin Smith, *Gorboduc*, Heilbronn, 1883, Introduction, pp. xxii-xxiv, and Homer Andrew Watt, *Gorboduc, or Ferrex and Porrex*, Bulletin of University of Wisconsin, Philology and Literature Series, vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 1-98.

Not maro with his meters maiestie  
 his loftie vers nor yet his wailful stile  
 wherwith he wrote the dolful tragedy  
 of Didoes deth by false Eneas wile  
 nor old ovid in his vnkind exile  
 his weping pen that wrott his plaintes with teares  
 could not set furth my sorowes nor my feares

Not Chaucer cheif that wrot in english vers  
 above the best that euer brittain bred  
 not his most pitous plaint that sure wold perce  
 the hardest hart that can be thought or sed  
 of *the black knight* for dolour welny ded  
 nor yet the pen wherwith he wrote the pain  
 or woful mary woful magdalain

no not the hand that did endite complaint  
 of faithful Troilus in all his woe  
 nor when Chresed did make so ruful plain  
 beknowing him whom she forsaked (disceved) so  
 although . . . so conningli ful well I know  
 was neuer boke that is or shalbe writ  
 what though this sorow far surpassed it

Not worthy wiat worthiest of them all  
 whom Brittain hath in later yeres furthbrought  
 his sacred psalmes wherin he singes the fall  
 of David dolling for the guilt he wrought  
 and Vries deth which he so dereli bought  
 not his hault vers that tainted hath the skie  
 for mortall domes to heuenlie and to hie

Not surrea he that hiest sittst in chair  
 of glistering fame for ay to live and raighn  
 not his proud ryme that thunders in the aier  
 nor at the plaintes wherin he wrote his pain  
 when he lay fetterd in the fyry chain  
 of cruell love they cold ne suffyse  
 plaintes in ful suffysa my wishe

And lest of all I that haue les than lest  
 may once attempt to pen the smallest part  
 of those longe dolours boiling in the brest  
 of Buckingham or sorowes endles smart  
 a drery sight to heuie for my hart  
 I want the stede wherof thei haue the store  
 I rather craue pardon then praise here fore.

for in my stile no sugred sawes are fownd  
 my songes ar not of solace or delight  
 of sobbes and sighes they rather yeld the sownd  
 and wofull dities all with dolour dight  
 black teares alas is that wherwith I write  
 my mirth is mone and all my plesure pain  
 my swetest ioy to sorow and to plain

my hed is heapt with paines and pensiefnes  
 my hart doth harbour nothing but vnrest  
 my hand hath nought but wo and hevines  
 huge heapes of harmes wherwith I am distrest  
 sighes vpon sighes smoke furth out of mi brest  
 streames floods and seas out of mine eies furth flow  
 I can not I depaint my smallest wo.

and well so sittes me al this dreynes  
 for in mi birth (ay me) I wot not why  
 but all was set to (pight on) wo and hevines  
 saturne et ?

---

Loke in the prologue of Bochas fol. lxiii<sup>1</sup>  
 I neuer lened to Helicon so mayni floods as part Brittain  
 part me from it  
 I neuer drank of pernasus spring  
 saue that a drop I wot not how pardi  
 was in my mouth let fal by mercurie  
 and that made me to haue a desire . . . but strait mercury  
 departed from me  
 mine eloquence is rudenes  
 I haue no fresh licour out of the conduictes of Calliope.  
 I haue no flowers of rethoricke through Clio.

---

note the ix muses dwel with Citherea on *parnasos*.

---

I writ the his fall of such as live ill yf thow  
 wilt nedes live their evell lief remember withall  
 their miserable deth.

I am to rude to boistous is my stile  
 vnsmooth and ragged (and vnsmooth) more rougher then  
 the file.

<sup>1</sup> Lines similar to these do actually occur on fol. lxiii in Lydgate's *Fall of Princes*, printed by Wayland (1555 ?). The complete title reads: "The tragedies gathered from Jhon Bochas, of all such princes as fell from theyr estates through the mutability of fortune. . . . Translated into English by John Lidgate, Monke of Bury."

his golden raies oreguilt the hilles . . . mone  
 and with his warme and gladsome beames gan drie  
 the erth that erst as cold as any stone  
 in teares bedewed the night did lie  
 wailing the absence of the worldes eie.<sup>1</sup>

remember Master Burdens promise for the showing of  
 Seneca's chorus (?) touching the captation of auram popularem.

<sup>1</sup> These lines and the following memorandum are written in the Secretary hand, while the rest of this portion of the manuscript is in the Italic. I think it is likely that they belong to the period of the writing of the main body of the manuscript, and that the other lines of this hitherto unprinted material were an earlier and abandoned beginning for the poem. Apparently the lines "his golden raies oreguilt the hilles, etc.," are another version of stanza 7 of the so-called *Induction*.

In a forthcoming edition of the manuscript I shall discuss other textual matters, and record all original and variant readings.

FOLLOW  
 boasting  
 which  
 importe  
 of the  
 exhibite  
 hoverin  
 and the  
 the wit  
 sentime  
 nationa  
 rendez  
 a place  
 war an  
 vulgar  
 new m  
 of thei  
 predile  
 especia  
 the m  
 tinued  
 at the  
 physic  
 this n  
 of the  
 attaini  
 the c  
 public  
 was i

## LONDON PLAYHOUSES, 1700-1705

By ALFRED JACKSON

FOLLOWING the Restoration of 1660, the English stage, although boasting a heritage of dramatic greatness, experienced new impulses which debased it to a very low level. Continental precepts, imported by a decadent court, clashing as they did with the ideas of the English predecessors, created a species of drama which exhibited a conglomeration of different forms. Tragedy showed a hovering between the classical and the domestic, the Shakespearian and the heroic, and comedy, although reflecting in subdued manner the wit of the preceding age, leaned in other directions towards the sentimental and the emotional. The playhouse itself, instead of a national institution embracing all classes, became primarily the rendezvous of the grand monde; a "House of Scandal"; fashionable; a place where the contemporary attitude towards priests and women, war and politics, could seek expression. The general taste was vulgar and partisan, and at the end of the seventeenth century the new middle class element, although aping the manners and fancies of their predecessors, brought less intelligent and more frivolous predilections to the theatre. Rowdyism, drunkenness, and disorder, especially on first nights, were common; and faction countenanced the much-exploited "packing" of audiences. Despite the continued existence of the English Puritan spirit, no attack was delivered at the prevailing licence until 1695, when Sir Richard Blackmore, physician and poet, published his *Prince Arthur*. In his preface to this moral epic, Blackmore attempted "to rescue the Muses out of the hands of the ravishers." His slight offensive, although attaining some contemporary vogue and receiving attention from the critics, was of small consequence, but may have stimulated public feeling a little in the right direction. In 1697 an Order was issued by William warning the London companies against

improper plays, and calling for increased vigilance on the part of the Master of Revels. Impetus for an attack against indecency was further encouraged by the Proclamation of 1698, which invigorated the Society for the Reformation of Manners and its kindred bodies. In 1698, too, the diatribe of the barrister Merriton, entitled *Immorality, Debauchery, and Prophaneness Exposed*, further assailed the vices of the age and prepared the way for Collier's *Short View*. The storm which this book aroused; the parts which Congreve, Dennis and others took need no enlargement here, but it seems certain, however, that Collier's onslaught had an influence tending markedly towards refinement. Exercise of Royal censorship, especially during the early years of Anne, was employed more frequently; actors, playhouses, and audiences were inveighed against by local magistrates, and the hilarity of comedy became somewhat uneasy.

Throughout the years 1700-1705, the newspaper references to the theatres deal mainly with their abuses. Repeated orders to the Master of Revels; attacks by Middlesex magistrates, animadversions by paper critics, occur often enough to prove that the national conscience had been thoroughly awakened. Licence, however, was only one aspect of the eighteenth-century playhouse, and the following extracts shed some light on its other features: the difficulties of the two London theatres—Drury Lane under Rich and Lincoln's Inn Fields an incommodious playhouse under Betterton and the secessionist actors; the time of the performances, which had altered since the Restoration; the prices of the seats raised for special occasions; and the incursion of operas and shows, all find notice in the contemporary press. The items arranged below, taken from the Burney Collection at the British Museum, contain, it is believed, everything of importance relating to the playhouses during the inclusive years. No notice, however, is taken here of performances of individual plays, as a separate article dealing with these will appear shortly in *P.L.M.A.*

(*Post Boy*, Dec. 30/Jan. 2, 1699-1700)

Cavendish Weedon, a Barrister of Lincoln's Inn, having observed a Voluntary subscription in the time of the late war to the New Play-house by Lincoln's Inn Fields, altho' there was at the same time two other Playhouses; hath proposed a subscription now in the Time of Peace for beautifying Great Lincoln's Inn Fields, one of the largest squares in the world. . . .

(*London Post*, Jan. 1/3, 1700)

This day at the Theatre Royal in Dorset-garden, the Famous Kentish Man Mr. Joy designs to show the same Tryals of Strength he had the honour of showing before his Majesty. . . .

(*Flying Post*, Jan. 20/23, 1700)

Bernard Lintott Bookseller, at the Post House at Middle Temple Gate, selleth most sorts of Plays at Nine Shillings per Dozen; and all sorts of Stationary Goods at reasonable Rates.

(*Post Boy*, Feb. 8/10, 1700)

This day is publish'd, A Second Defence of the Short View of the Prophaneness and Immorality of the English Stage, &c. Being a Reply to a Book Entituled, The Ancient and Modern Stage Survey'd &c By Jeremy Collier M.A. Printed for S. Keble. . . . Brit. Mus. 641. e. 8. 8<sup>2</sup>. 1700.

(*Post Boy*, Feb. 8/10, 1700)

The Ancient and Modern Stages survey'd: or, Mr. Collier's View of the Immorality and Prophaneness of the English Stage set in a true light. Wherein Mr. Collier's false and mistaken Citations and Authorities from the Ancient Fathers, Philosophers, Orators, Historians, Poets &c are consider'd and corrected, and the Comparative Morality of the English Stage asserted upon the Parallel. By Dr. Drake. Printed for Abel Roper. . . . Brit. Mus. 855. d. 24. 8<sup>o</sup>. 1699.

(*Post Man*, March 19/21, 1700)

This day is published, the Third Book of Theater Music, being a Collection of the newest Aires . . . made for the playhouses, particularly those in the new opera.

(*Flying Post*, May 18/21, 1700)

The Grand Jury of London, made a Presentation last Sessions against frequenting Playhouses as a Publick Nuisance and a dangerous and growing evil, corrupting the morals and Principles of the Youth, and desired that Playhouse Bills might not be hence-forth posted up in the City. Several Persons were fined last week for selling bawdy Pictures and Boxes.

(*Post Boy*, May 28/30, 1700)

This day at the King's Playhouse . . . the Tempest . . . at the Request of several Seafaring Men.

(*Post Boy*, May 30/June 1, 1700)

The Opera of the Prophetess . . . is therefore deferred till Monday.

(*Flying Post*, June 13/15, 1700)

We are credibly informed that Yesterday a Trial was brought on in the Court of Common Pleas against one of the Players, for Prophanely using the Name of God upon the Stage, contrary to an Act of Parliament made in King James the First's time; and that the verdict was given against the Player, according to the Tenor of the said Act. . . .

(*London Post*, June 28/July 1, 1700)

Yesterday the Play called the Tempest was acted at the Old Playhouse; and that called Love for Love at the New, both for the benefit of the poor English Slaves &c and I am told that the sum arising thereby amounted to about £250. [*Not in Genest.*]

(*London Post*, July 5/8, 1700)

This day at the Theatre Royal in Drury Lane will be presented a Play called Sophonisba, or Hannibal's Overthrow not performed by the Publick Actors, but all by the young Gentlemen and Ladies for their own Diversion The benefit for the young people of the House. [*Not in Genest.*]

(*English Post*, Nov. 8/11, 1700)

On Friday last there was a full House at the Playhouse in Drury Lane, the play of the Old Batchelor being to be acted; but Capt. Griffin who was chief actor therein, being taken ill, they were dismissed all having their money returned.

(*Post Boy*, Dec. 5/7, 1700)

The Actors of the Theatre Royal finding the Inconveniency to the Gentry of Playing so late at night, are resolved to continue beginning their plays at the Hour of Five every day, as exprest in their Bills.

(*English Post*, Dec. 13/16, 1700)

On Friday last there was a great disturbance at the Playhouse in Drury Lane, some persons pelting the Auditors and Actors with Oranges &c. . . . which so enraged them, that they threatened to throw one of the Aggressors out of the upper gallery into the pit, which might have endangered his life had not the Constable come forward and prevented any further disorder.

(*Post Man*, Dec. 17/19, 1700)

Account of the scathing remarks made by the Grand Jury of Middlesex against the Playhouses and Bear-Gardens.

(*Post Boy*, Jan. 21/24, 1701)

This day is published, The Life of the Late famous Comedian Jo. Haynes, containing his comical exploits and adventures both at home and abroad. Published by Tobias Thomas his Fellow Comedian according to Mr. Haynes' Directions a little before his Death. Oct. Price 1s. Sold by J. Nutt. . . . Brit. Mus. 641. e. 18 (1). 8°. 1701. With a few MSS. notes.

(*Post Boy*, March 1/4, 1701)

We are informed that the famous Comedian Mr. William Bowen who has for some months discontinued acting on account of some Difference between him and the rest of the Sharers of the New Theatre, is to have the Committee, Sir Robert Howard's Celebrated Comedy play'd at the said theatre for his benefit on Thursday next the 6th instant; the part of Teague is that which he has made choice of for himself in it, and it's the opinion of the best Judges in Town that no person in either of the Theatres can come so Near the Performance of the famous Original Mr. Lucy as he can; It is reported that after this performance which is to be his last on the English Stage, he designs for Ireland, which will be a great advantage to that stage, and in all Probability no small loss to this.

(*English Post*, March 21/24, 1701)

There is great Expectation from the Boy this day dances at the King's Playhouse he being reputed to perform equal to Monsieur Ballon.

(*Post Boy*, March 22/24, 1701)

On Wednesday the 26th of March, in York Buildings will be performed a Consort of Vocal and Instrumental Musick; with new pieces of Musick and particular performances of instrumental Musick, by Mr. Dean. And likewise an Extraordinary Italian song performed by a Boy lately arrived from Italy being the first time of his singing in Publick in England; to begin exactly at 8 a clock by reason the Performance will be somewhat longer in that Place. For the Benefit of Mr. Dean and Mr. Mainshipp. . . .

(*London Post*, April 9/11, 1701)

This present Friday being the 11th of April, at the Playhouse in Dorset Garden, will be performed Mr. Purcel's Musick for the Prize. The Profit of the Galleries are for the benefit of Mr. Doggett and Mr. Wilks they having farmed it of the performers.

(*Post Boy*, May 3/6, 1701)

On Monday next will be performed the long-expected new opera call'd the Virgin Prophetess, or the Fate of Troy. . . .

(*Post Man*, May 13/15, 1701)

This day . . . will be performed &c. . . . And this is publish'd to request all Persons of Quality not to come behind the scenes, it being otherwise impossible to move the great Changes of them thro' the Play. . . .

(*Post Boy*, May 15/17, 1701)

At the Theatre in Dorset Garden on Wednesday the 21st of this Instant by the Command of Several of the Nobility and Gentry will be

a Performance of Musick in English, Italian and French by Mr. John Abell, beginning exactly at Six. The first Gallery 3 shillings, the upper gallery One shilling and six pence. No person to go into the Box or Pit but the Subscribers. Subscriptions will be taken in at Mr. White's Chocolate House in Saint James's Street till Tuesday night.

(*Post Boy*, May 31/June 3, 1701)

At the Theatre in Dorset Garden this present Tuesday being the Third of June will be performed all the Pieces of Musick contending for the Prize; the Gallery being at the same Rates as at the single Performances. For the benefit of Mr. Doggett and Mr. Wilks, they having farmed them of the performers.

(*Post Boy*, June 3/5, 1701)

No plays being allowed to be acted at either Theatres the Friday or Saturday before Whitsunday next; This is to give notice that the play called *Love Makes a Man*, or the *Fop's Fortune*, for that reason is deferr'd till Friday the 13th of June for the benefit of William Pinkeman; And Whereas Tickets were delivered for Saturday next, this is to Certify that the said Tickets will positively Pass tomorrow 7-night the 13th instant, it being to be acted that day at the Theatre Royal. With several entertainments which will be express'd upon the Bills.

(*Post Man*, August 19/21, 1701)

Empress of Morocco. With original Masque . . . the Company will continue acting there three times a week during the term of Bartholomew Fair.

(*London Post*, Sept. 19/22, 1701)

This day is published, A Scourge for the Playhouses, with a character of the English Stage.

(*Post Boy*, Dec. 27/30, 1701)

On Saturday night a Footman was killed at the Playhouse door in Little-Lincoln's Inn Fields by a Centinel that guarded the door who shot him as he was endeavouring to get in by force. There were some others wounded.

(*Flying Post*, Feb. 17/19, 1702)

Last Monday came on the Tryal against the Playhouse near Lincoln's Inn Fields at the King's Bench Bar, on an Indictment before the Rt Honourable the Ld. Ch. Justice Holt. The Evidence against the Players for the most abominable, impious, prophane, lew'd, and immoral Expressions acted by them, appeared very full and plain, and the Jury brought them in guilty accordingly; which it is hoped will be much to the satisfaction of all true Friends to Religion and Vertue.

(*Post M*

If an  
house in  
from the  
to sell t  
Profits o  
to enter  
price th  
Lane, an

(*Flying*

Pub  
Examen  
Funera  
In a Di  
1702.

(*Post E*

No  
sive P  
Dialog  
many  
girdle  
Mr. P  
Mr. R

(*Flyin*

TI  
the T  
Mr. C  
Crow  
Esq.

(*Dail*

C  
Cour

(*Post*

S  
conc  
or P  
meet  
diffe  
at 5

(*Dar*

(*Post Man*, March 5/7, 1702)

If any Persons who have any Interest in the Joint Stock of the Playhouse in Drury Lane by any grant or purchase under the Patents granted from the Crown to Sir William Davenant or Mr. Killegrew, are willing to sell their said Interest, whether shares or part of shares arising by Profits of Acting in the said Playhouse, this is to desire all such persons to enter their names, their lodgings, what shares they have and the lowest price they will set at, with Mr. Thomas Hay near the Pump in Chancery Lane, and they shall be treated with for the same.

(*Flying Post*, April 11/14, 1702)

Published this day, A Comparison between the Two Stages with an Examen of the Generous Conqueror and some critical Remarks on the Funeral, or Grief-Alamode, the False Frind, Tamerlane and others. In a Dialogue. Sold by the Booksellers. . . . Brit. Mus. 641. b. 26. 8°. 1702.

(*Post Boy*, May 12/14, 1702)

Now in the Press and will speedily be published, Theatra Vindicata, sive Poetarum Anglicorum Defensio. In answer to a late Scurrilous Dialogue intituled (A Comparison between the Two Stages) wherein are many scandalous Reflections upon Mr. Betterton, Mrs. Barry, Mrs. Bracegirdle, Mrs. Rogers, Mrs. Oldfield, Mr. Powell, Mr. Cibber, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Pinkethman &c As likewise on Mr. Congreve &c Dedicated to Mr. Rich, patentee of the Theatre Royal in Drury Lane.

(*Flying Post*, May 16/19, 1702)

There is now in the Press, A Short Defence of the Comparison of the Two Stages &c or a Review of the Excellencies of the most Ingenious Mr. Gildon, Mr. D'Urfey, Mr. Boyer, Mr. Cibber, Mr. Brett and Mr. Crown. To which is added, The Life of the Authors, Henry Ramble Esq. . . . and Theophilus Critick. Writ by themselves.

(*Daily Courant*, Jan. 20, 1703)

Consort of Musick. . . . A Comedy of Two Acts only called the Country House . . . and no persons to be admitted in Masks.

(*Post Man*, March 9/11, 1703)

Sir Thomas Skipwith, Mr. Rich and all persons who are any ways concerned in the Playhouse in Drury-Lane whether in the House, Rents, or Profits of Acting Comedies &c. . . . They are earnestly desired to meet at the Old Devil Tavern, to make an Amicable agreement of all differences. They are all desired to meet on Saturday the 13th instant at 5 of the clock.

(*Daily Courant*, March 10, 1703)

At the Theatre Royal. . . . The Old Mode and the New. . . .

(*Daily Courant*, March 13th, 1703)

. . . "the play being shortened at least an hour in the action."

(*Daily Courant*, April 29, 1703)

. . . Cheats of Scapin. And a Comedy of two acts called The Comical Rivals, . . . To begin at Five so that all may be done by Nine a clock.

(*Daily Courant*, May 20, 1703)

. . . Volpone. . . . By reason of the extream hot weather this play being deferr'd to be acted on Wednesday last the same will now be positively performed.

(*Daily Courant*, June 8, 1703)

. . . The Fair Penitent. . . . By reason of the Entertainments the play will be shortened.

(*Observer*, July 21/24, 1703)

Danger of Plays to the Kingdom of England discussed.

(*Daily Courant*, Oct. 4, 1703)

Her Majesty's Servants of the Theatre Royal being returned from the Bath, do intend on Wednesday the Sixth of this Instant October to act a Comedy called Love Makes a Man, or the Fop's Fortune, And Whereas the audiences have been incommoded by plays usually beginning too late, the company of the said theatre do therefore give notice that they will constantly begin at Five without Fail, and continue the same hour all the winter. [*Not in Genest; Nicoll, p. 39.*]

(*Observer*, Oct. 20/25, 1703)

Epilogues and Prologues discussed.

(*Observer*, Oct. 27/30, 1703)

New Playhouse in Goodman's Fields discussed.

(*Daily Courant*, Oct. 29, 1703)

. . . The Lancashire Witches. . . . At common prices.

(*Flying Post*, Jan. 4/6, 1704)

Mr. Collier's Dissuasive from the Play House. In a Letter to a Person of Quality, occasion'd by the late Calamity of the Tempest. Printed for Rich Sare at Gray's Inn Gate in Holborn. . . . To which is now added, A Letter written by another Hand, In Answer to some Queries sent by a Person of Quality, relating to the Irregularities charged upon the Stage. Printed for Richard Sare. . . . Brit. Mus. 641. e. 12 (9). 8°. Lond. 1704.

(*Daily Courant*, Jan. 20, 1704)

This present day is published, A Representation of the Impiety and Immorality of the English Stage. With Reasons for putting a stop thereto; and some Questions address'd to those who frequent the Play-houses. Price 3d. Also some Thoughts concerning the Stage, in a Letter to a Lady. Price 2d. Sold by J. Nutt. . . . Letter to a Lady, Brit. Mus. 693. c. 36 (3). 8°. 1706.

(*Post Man*, Jan. 20/22, 1704)

We hear there were given at all the churches within the Bills of Mortality and places adjacent, last Fast-day to the people, several Books of several kinds, setting forth the Horrid, Blasphemous and Abominable Expressions used upon the Stages in our Playhouses, with Disswasives to all Persons in general from frequenting them; and particular applications to Parents and others who have the Care of Youth, to discourage and restrain their Relations and friends from resorting to so dangerous a place.

(*Daily Courant*, Jan. 24, 1704)

Command for Regulation of Theatres (no woman to wear masks; nobody to go upon or behind the stage, &c. . . .)

(*Daily Courant*, Feb. 8, 1704)

Letter to Rich from mistress of servant who threw oranges at players at Drury Lane.

(*Observer*, Feb. 12/16, 1704)

Her Majesty's Order concerning the Playhouse discussed. [See also following number.]

(*Daily Courant*, Feb. 22, 1704)

Whereas the Play of Mary Queen of Scotland (till now wholly incorrect and imperfect and long since printed tho' not suffered to be acted) hath been revised and amended, with most material and considerable alterations both in Title and Substance, and will be suddenly acted by Her Majesty's Permission at the Theatre Royal in Drury Lane. All people are desired to take notice (to prevent any mistake) it will soon after the acting thereof be printed according to the new copy, and as it is now licenced. . . . Brit. Mus. 644. g. 3 4°. 1704.

(*Daily Courant*, March 9, 1704)

Whereas great Complaints have been made to Her Majesty of many indecent, prophane, and immoral Expressions that are usually spoken by Players and Mountebanks, contrary to Religion and Good Manners, and thereupon Her Majesty has lately given Orders to Charles Killegrew Esq., Her Majesty's Master of the Revels to take especial care to correct all such abuses. The said Master of the Revels does therefore hereby

require all Stage-Players, Mountebanks, and all other Persons mounting stages or otherwise, to bring their several plays, Drolls, Farces, Interludes, Dialogues, Epilogues, and other Entertainments fairly written to him at his Office in Somerset-house to be by him perused, corrected and allow'd under his hand pursuant to Her Majesty's Commands, upon pain of being proceeded against for Contempt of Her Majesty's said Order. Whereof all Magistrates are hereby desired to take notice and to be aiding and assisting therein unto the said Master in pursuing the Ends of Her Majesty's Royal Intentions for Reformation of Manners.

(*Daily Courant*, March 9, 1704)

. . . and on Thursday next being the 16th day of March will be presented a Play called, The Albion Queens, or the Death of Mary Queen of Scotland. And by reason of the extraordinary charge in the decoration of it, the Prices are raised. Boxes 5/-, Pit 3/-, first Gallery 2/-, Upper Gallery 1/-. Being the Sixth time of acting it for the benefit of the author.

(*London Gazette*, April 10/13, 1704)

Whereas the Master of the Revels has received Information that several Companies of Strolling Actors pretend to have Licences from Noblemen and presume under that pretence to avoid the Master of the Revels, his Correcting of their Plays, Drolls, Farces, & Interludes which being against Her Majesty's intentions and Directions to the said Master These are to signify that such Licences are not of any force or Authority. There are likewise several Mountebanks acting upon Stages and Mountebanks on Horseback, Persons that keep Poppets, and others that make Show of Monsters and Strange Sights of Living Creatures who presume to Travel without the said Master of the Revels Licence, of which all Magistrates are hereby desired to take notice, and to be Aiding and Assisting unto the said Master, as well as in pursuing the End of Her Majesty's Royal Intentions for Reforming all indecencies and Abuses of the Stage, as in not permitting any Plays, Drolls, Farces, Interludes, Mountebanks, Poppet Shows or Shows of Monsters and Strange Sights of Living Creatures in their Respective Cities or Corporations without Authority from the said Master of the Revels from his Office at Somerset House: who upon notice of any such Actors, Mountebanks, or Show Keepers, presuming to Act contrary to the Directions above mentioned, will be ready to proceed against them for their Contempt.

(*Daily Courant*, April 18, 1704)

A Representation of the Impiety and Immorality of the English Stage, with Reasons for putting a stop thereto; And Some Questions address'd to those who frequent the Playhouses. The Fourth Edition.

(*Post Man*, April 20/22, 1704)

The New Theatre in Bath will be opened the First Week in May next.

(*Daily C*

Mr.  
Hide Pa  
the first  
perform  
the Bill  
produce  
Nine an  
blacks.  
Mr. Pir  
Any bo  
man, e

(*Daily*

Her  
chang'  
Fair.

(*Diver*

M.  
Article  
applau

(*Diver*

T  
Esq)  
finish  
Hand  
Voca

(*Dai*

from  
latte  
Dan

(*Lon*

the  
Con  
Gov  
rep  
Joh  
Per  
the  
to

(*Daily Courant*, April 27, 1704)

Mr Pinkeman. In Brookfield Market-Place at the East Corner of Hide Park is a Fair to be kept for the space of sixteen days beginning the first of May. . . . And in Mr. Pinkeman's Droll-Booth will be performed several entertainments which will be expressed at large upon the Bills, especially one very surprizing, that the whole world never yet produced the like, viz. he speaks an Epilogue upon an Elephant between Nine and Ten Foot High, arrived from Guinea, led upon the Stage by six blacks. The Booth is easily known by the Picture of the Elephant and Mr. Pinkeman sitting in state on his back on the outside of his booth. Any body that wants Ground for Shops or Booths may hire it of Mr. Pinkeman, enquire at the Bull-head in Brookfield-market alias May-Fair.

(*Daily Courant*, July 25, 1704)

Her Majesty's Servants at the Theatre Royal (the weather being chang'd) intend to act on Wednesdays and Fridays till Bartholomew Fair. . . .

(*Diverting Post*, Oct. 28, 1704)

Mr. Estcourt the famous Comedian of Ireland, who entered into Articles, with Christopher Rich Esq. to Play ten Times has with great applause performed the Parts of the Spanish Fryar. . . .

(*Diverting Post*, Oct. 28, 1704)

The Play-house in the Hay-market (the Architect being John Vanbrugh Esq) built by the Subscription Money of most of our Nobility, is almost finished, in the meantime two operas translated from the Italian by good Hands . . . are to be perform'd by the best Artists eminent both for Vocal and instrumental Musick at the opening of the House.

(*Daily Courant*, Nov. 29, 1704)

. . . Note, That the Theatre in Dorset Garden being now repaired from Damage done by the late great Winds, the same will be ready by the latter end of this Week to Act in, or for Entertainments of Musick and Dancing. . . .

(*London Gazette*, Dec. 21/25, 1704)

Anne R. Whereas we have thought fit for the better Reforming of the Abuse and Immorality of the Stage, That a New Company of Comedians should be Established for Our Service and under Stricter Government and Regulations than have been formerly. We, therefore, reposing especial trust and Confidence in our Trusted and Well-beloved John Vanbrugh and William Congreve Esqs; for the due Execution and Performance of this Our Will and Pleasure, and give and grant unto them the said John Vanbrugh and William Congreve, full Power and Authority, to Form, Constitute, and Establish for Us, a Company of Comedians

with Full and Free Licence to Act, and Represent, in any convenient Place, during our Pleasure, any Comedies, Tragedies, Plays, Interludes, Operas, and to perform any other Theatrical and Musical Entertainment whatsoever, and to settle such Rules and Orders for the good Government of the said Company, as the Chamberlain of Our Household shall from time to time Direct and Approve of. Given at Our Court of St. James's this 14th day of December in the Third Year of Our Reign. By Her Majesty's Command.

(*Observer*, Dec. 29/Jan. 1704/5)

Prophanity of Playhouses discussed ; especially prophane talk. [See also following number.]

(*London Gazette*, Feb. 19/22, 1705)

The Playhouse in Lincoln's Inn Fields is to be let, or disposed of on a Building Lease, or to be sold. Enquire of Mr. Robert Moore, a Bookseller, at the Bible in Serle-street near Lincoln's Inn Back-Gate. (Repeated *L.G.* April 2/5).

(*Post Man*, July 19/21, 1705)

Serious Reflections on the Scandalous Abuse and Effects of the Stage in a Sermon preach'd at the Parish Church of St Nicholas in the City of Bristol, on Sunday the 7th day of January 1704/5. By Arthur Bedford M.A. Vicar of Temple Church in the aforesaid City. Bristol, printed and Sold by W. Benning in Corn-street, and A. Baldwin in Warwick-lane.

(*Daily Courant*, July 20, 1705)

Note, That the Company will continue to Act at the Theatre in Little-Lincoln's Inn Fields till Her Majesty's Theatre in the Hay-Market be intirely furnish'd.

(*Observer*, Sept. 5/8, 1705)

Comments on Prophaneness and Irreligion of the Playhouse.

LAN

WHOE  
in Sk

A VII,  
at  
B VI,

Skeat  
note,

N  
appa  
and n

I

the

hens

deta

for

spel

follo

tion

tent

true

bac

late

val

N.

Pie

or

an

Bo

## NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

### LANGLAND, THE "NAKET," THE "NAUȜTY," AND THE DOLE

WHOEVER compares the A and B texts of *Piers Plowman*, as set forth in Skeat's edition, will presently reach these corresponding lines :

A VII, 212. That neodi ben, or naket . and nouȝt haue to spende  
and

B VI, 226. That nedy ben, and nauȝty . helpe hem with thi godis.

Skeat glosses "nauȝty," "having nothing, very poor"; and, in a note, "having naught."

*N.E.D.* under *Naughty* cites this passage from the B text, apparently as the first recorded use of the word in any of its senses, and renders it thus : "Having or possessing naught ; poor, needy."

In spite of these authorities, I wish to suggest that in this passage the word "naughty" has a strong flavour of the notion "*reprehensibly worthless*," in other words to accord it the *second* sense detailed in *N.E.D.*, namely, "of persons : Morally bad, wicked," for which the earliest quotation given by *N.E.D.*, under this spelling, is 1529. Under the spelling *Noughty* will be found the following : "Of Persons. Abject, worthless, vile", with a quotation dated 1395 from the *Plowman's Tale* III. 1097. If my contention with regard to this word as here used in the B text be true, then the pejorative sense of *naughty* or *noughty* will date back at least as far as 1377.

I may here mention, with a relevance that will be appreciated later, the use of *naught* as an adjective, meaning "of no worth or value ; good for nothing ; worthless, useless, bad, poor," for which *N.E.D.* quotes King Alfred and other early authorities, including *Piers Plowman*, C xviii, 74, where it undoubtedly means "worthless" or "bad" as applied to coins. This word, as applied to persons, and meaning "good for nothing" will be found under *nāwih̄t* in Bosworth and Toller, *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*.

To return to Langland, the two relevant passages in full are :

A VII, 212. That neodi ben, or naket . and nouȝt haue to spende,  
With mete or with moneye . mak hem fare the betere  
Or with word or with werk . while that thou art here.  
Mak the frendes ther-with . for so seint Matheu techeth,  
*Facite vobis amicos de mammona iniquitatis.*

B VI, 226. That nedy ben, and nauȝty . helpe hem with thi godis,  
Loue hem and lakke hem nouȝte . late god take the veniaunce ;  
Theigh thei done yuel . late thouw god y-worthe :—  
*Michi vindictam, et ego retribuam.*  
And if thou wilt be graciose to god . do as the gospel techeth,  
And biloue the amonges low men . so shaltow lacche grace,  
*Facite vobis amicos de mamona iniquitatis.*

The B phrase "Theigh thei done yuel" and the context of Divine retribution indicate very clearly that the "nauȝty" are seriously to blame for something ; and the point of contention (that already in 1377 "nauȝty" can mean "reprehensibly worthless") may perhaps be conceded without further discussion. But a closer scrutiny of these most interesting passages is valuable not only because it unequivocally defines the sense in which "nauȝty" must here be taken but also because it invites speculation about the methods of the B Reviser.

In general terms, then, the B Reviser has here rehandled a line in A, has substituted four new lines in place of three discarded, has added a second Latin tag, and, in doing all this, has given a new turn to the thought.

Whatever else characterises the technique of the B Reviser, three points in his method are abundantly clear. First, so far from "not understanding" A, he is continually at pains to make the sense of A still more lucid and emphatic ; secondly, this additional lucidity and emphasis is specially bestowed upon passages that are vital to the *main structural lines of the whole poem* and its general argument ; for, if I may here hazard a guess, based in part upon *a priori* likelihood and in part upon this very fact, the B Reviser set himself first, (if he was Langland, in the sudden glory of a "second wind"), to write a new *end* to the poem, beginning at the last Passus of Dowel A (which he scrapped), supplying the majority of Dowel B, and creating Dobet and Dobest. He then returned to the first eleven Passus of A to rehandle, omit, or interpolate by the guidance of his newly-acquired conception of the poetic structure as a whole ; for, as

Mensen  
congerie  
wearisom  
third cl  
general  
the pres

Ana

be a p  
interm  
contrap  
the he  
progra  
upon  
biograp  
doom  
somet  
they  
and b  
but I  
the P  
wher  
Such  
expla

T  
maki  
direc  
Tru  
con  
part  
(sim  
tha  
com  
to c  
Sin  
com  
wh  
tion  
of

vol

Mensendieck and Wells<sup>1</sup> have pointed out, *Piers Plowman* is not a congeries of visionary digressions, some picturesque and others wearisome, but a highly organised and well-constructed poem. The third characteristic of the B Reviser which is here in point is his general care to supply defective alliteration. The bearing of this on the present discussion will be suggested later.

Analysis of the structure of *Piers Plowman* speedily reveals it to be a poem of several depths, which are, if the phrase be allowed, intermittently simultaneous, not unlike themes in music treated contrapuntally. One "voice" (to borrow a term from fugue) is the heavenly road and its signposts; another is the practical programme for the business of this world; a third is commentary upon the existing state of things; a fourth is the spiritual autobiography of the poet; a fifth the foreshadowing of a prophetic doom; and so forth. These voices are sometimes heard singly; sometimes they blend and coalesce in varying proportion; frequently they interrupt each other, though seldom harshly. So complex and beautiful a structure is not easy to resolve into its components, but I propose tentatively to excerpt one train of thought, starting with the Prologue and tracing it through to that point in A VII and B VI where the B Reviser changed the "naked" into the "naughty." Such an analysis, by showing the *direction* of the thought, should explain the change.

The Prologue shows the active world engaged rather upon making a living than upon living itself, because it lacks a spiritual directing force. A I suggests the nature of this needed force, namely Truth-Love (honesty, fear of God, neighbourliness); this general condition and its remedy being thus specified, the poet proceeds to particulars. A II-IV poses the problems of *administrative abuses* (simony, bribery and commandeering), and supplies the solution that government must be conducted according to the dictates of conscience and reason. A V returns from officialdom to private life to consider the *abuses at large in society*, tracing them to the Seven Sins; for which the remedy is the Sacrament of Penance (contrition, confession and reparation). A VI (which is included in B V, a somewhat more logical arrangement) shows the world attempting reparation (the third part of a valid confession) by performing the penance of a pilgrimage to Truth (honesty) under the guidance of Piers

<sup>1</sup> *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, vol. ix, No. 3, also *P.M.L.A.*, vol. xlv, No. 1.

Plowman. A VII (the Passus under our immediate consideration) deals with *economic problems*, of which there are two. The first is "How to save the world from physical (and spiritual) famine?" To which the solution is "Honest and loving work (for the love of Christ) by all." The second is "How to deal with Unemployables and other Detrimentials, who, though capable of work, prefer to sing 'Hey! trolly-tolly!'" To this two answers are suggested: the first is to send for Hunger, *i.e.* to let them starve—for, as Piers says to Hunger,

I wot wel whon thou art i-went . thei wol worchen ful ille (A VII, 193)

This, however, is not a Christian solution.

And heo beoth my blodi bretheren . for god bougte vs alle.  
Treuthe tauhte me ones . to louen hem vchone,  
And helpen hem of alle thyng . aftur that hem neodeth

(A VII, 196-98)

This Divine command to pity even the wastrels is to be put into effect by maintaining the bold beggars "that mowen her mete biswinke" with a not too luxurious *dole*, of hound's bread, horse bread and beans. Those, however, who are not idle malingerers, but who are undeservedly but genuinely disabled from work, "that neodi ben, or naket" are to be comforted with a certain measure of liberality. The parables of the New Testament are never very far from Langland's thought, and this notion of a loving liberality, by a characteristic jump of association, reminds him of a parable guaranteeing the effects of *cautious* liberality in this world; so down goes "*facite vobis amicos de mammona iniquitatis*," though the iniquity of the naked was not perhaps quite obvious. Thus the A text.

Let us now attempt the difficult task of imagining the processes in the mind of the B Reviser when he reached this passage. He was, we have postulated, alert for occasions to clarify and to emphasise, especially where the main structural lines of thought seemed insufficiently stressed in A. Such a line would clearly be the solution of his second major economic problem, namely a dole of bread even for those idle vagabonds that his poem, as a whole, is at such pains to denounce. This paradox of kindness and reprobation, for its strangeness and importance, deserved an expanded, a more emphatic handling; compared to such an idea the Christian platitude that we must support the deserving poor was hardly worth mentioning: it was an obvious duty. But very far from obvious and

indeed revolutionary was his startlingly modern thesis that out-of-work stalwarts must be maintained by a dole. This was a contribution to Christian economics that deserved a real prominence in the scheme of Langland's thought. The B Reviser, therefore, set about to give it more emphasis.

Two words in A gave him the clue: one was "nouȝt" and the other "*iniquitatis*." Perhaps, if he shared the philological interests of the C Reviser (famous for his grammatical discourse on the meanings of "Meed"), he may have paused midway in the line, thus:

That neodi ben, or naket . and nouȝt. . . .

and it may have occurred to him that "nouȝt," though a noun, could equally be used as an adjective, meaning bad, worthless, and that here was the word upon which he could base his rehandling—omit the commonplace that blameless indigence must be succoured, and insist on his major idea that a Christian State has a duty even to the worthless. Or perhaps the word *iniquitatis* supplied the clue, linking itself by an easy association with the bold beggars a dozen lines back. One or both of these mental jumps must, I think, have happened. At all events the B Reviser started his correction at the point "that neodi ben, or naket," and significantly rehandled it to "that nedy ben, and nauȝty": the force of the "and" (it will be noticed) is almost as strong as that of the "nauȝty"—the correction is not "that nedy ben or nauȝty" but "*and* nauȝty," i.e. "those who are not merely needy, but whose neediness is reprehensible," a much stronger and an entirely different idea, one which leads to a new Latin quotation insisting that God is the only avenger however much "yuel" the "nauȝty" have done.

Let us now consider the emendations of the B Reviser from another angle. As has been said, a marked characteristic of the B revision is that alliteration, faulty in A, is corrected. Scores of examples can be taken to show that "B" had an alert eye for such metrical improvements, even when the meaning is not materially altered by the change. It must be admitted that "B" does not invariably supply alliteration when it is lacking in A, and there are some changes by "B" which do not (in our opinion) improve the meaning, but which nevertheless sacrifice the alliteration in A and fail to alliterate in B. But on the whole examples where "happy undeserving A" is metrically changed for the worse are rare, whereas "B's" corrections of defective alliteration are frequent; and it

therefore seems a safe assumption that "B" did not generally sacrifice alliteration but with good cause.

In the two lines which form the subject of this essay, where A has "that *neodi ben or naket . and nouȝt haue to spende*," B reads "that *nedy ben and nauȝty . helpe hem with thi godis*." I suggest, therefore, that in this instance "B" was ready to sacrifice the alliteration for the sake of his desire to expand and expound his staggering doctrine of a dole to the worthless. Whether it is an impertinence or not to suggest how the mind of a very great poet, centuries dead, may have worked in the recasting of an earlier poem, it seems justifiable at least to believe that when he wrote "and nauȝty" for "or naket," he was deliberately using "nauȝty" to mean "reprensibly worthless" and not simply "having naught."

No student of *Piers Plowman* can avoid partisan feeling about the problem of authorship. I do not, however, believe that any argument whatever can be drawn from the foregoing observations in that respect. The passages we have considered from A and B neither indicate nor deny plural authorship. All that can, in this instance, be said is that the B Reviser at least understood and gave a luminous prominence to A's more important idea at the expense of his platitude. It is interesting to notice "C's" reaction to the passage. "C" appears to have taken offence at "B's" failure to alliterate in l. 226. For "That nedy ben, and nauȝty . helpe hem with thi godis" "C" wrote: "In meschief other in mal-ese . and thow mowe hem helpe," and this change (perhaps) forced him to abandon, as a *non-sequitur* "*Michi vindictam et ego retribuam*" and its surrounding lines. On the other hand, if here "C" seems to revert to the commonplaces of "A," he makes a more skilled modulation to the other Latin phrase, guided by a more sensitive comprehension of the parable in question:

Yf thow hast wonne ouht wickeliche . wisliche dispende hit;  
*Facite nobis amicos de mammona iniquitatis.*

(C IX, 235)

"C" is here, in fact, at "B's" game of reinforcing structural ideas present in A (and B). The restitution of "wicked winnings" is one of the great organising ideas of the whole poem in all its versions; nor only that: the good life itself is a debt to God. In these passages neither reviser has "spoilt" or "misunderstood" the preceding versions. The A text offers the least interesting reading

of the three ; the B text is more vigorously emphatic ; the C text more subtly modulated. The changes are changes of emphasis, but not necessarily of authorship.

N. K. COGHILL.

PROMOS AND CASSANDRA AND THE LAW AGAINST  
LOVERS

W. A. NEILSON has summarised the chief differences between Shakespeare's treatment of the Promos and Cassandra story and Whetstone's ;<sup>1</sup> Hazelton Spencer has shown very carefully the similarities and dissimilarities existing between Shakespeare's version and Davenant's ;<sup>2</sup> but no scholar, so far as I know, has noted the peculiar similarities existing between Whetstone's version and Davenant's. It is, of course, obvious that Davenant is in the main reworking *Measure for Measure* in his *Law Against Lovers*, adding three characters from *Much Ado About Nothing* ; but some of his variations from the *Measure for Measure* story are interesting and merit, I believe, less of condemnation than explanation.

Professor Spencer says of Davenant's play, "In general, the most serious omission is that of the Mariana story," a statement extremely similar to what Neilson says of the difference between Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure* and Whetstone's *Promos and Cassandra*.<sup>3</sup> Neilson says, "The most profound change [from *Promos and Cassandra* to *Measure for Measure*] is in the creation of the rôle of Mariana."<sup>4</sup> Thus, Davenant and Whetstone agree in using no Mariana. Shakespeare invented the rôle. It would seem, then, that Davenant's omission of Mariana and her story from his play can be accounted for historically, that it does not necessarily mean he had a perverted taste not to follow Shakespeare in this matter.<sup>5</sup> He was, I believe, going back to the older version of the tale for authority to change.

That he must have been doing so becomes almost a surety when one considers that the part of Davenant's Isabella in its main features is very close to that of Whetstone's Cassandra. Each is married, indeed very happily married, to the deputy at the end of her play. If Shakespeare saves his Isabella from the cruelty of having her brother's head (supposedly his head) sent to her on a platter,

<sup>1</sup> *Student's Cambridge Shakespeare*, p. 326.

<sup>2</sup> *Shakespeare Improved*, Cambridge, 1927, pp. 137-153.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 144.

<sup>4</sup> *Student's Cambridge Shakespeare*, p. 326. <sup>5</sup> *Shakespeare Improved*, p. 144.

Davenant in addition saves his heroine from being ravished by the deputy. But Davenant, like Whetstone, does not spare his deputy the villainy of promising marriage to the forlorn lady in order to seduce her, though Davenant's deputy is hardly so successful in his designs as Whetstone's.<sup>1</sup>

Davenant, moreover, seems to follow Whetstone rather than his more immediate model in his early conception of the character of Angelo. Shakespeare builds up a strong Puritanism in the deputy, a strong moral sense, before he allows him to see Isabella, showing that this man can and will have a moral struggle before he gives in to his baser nature.<sup>2</sup> Not so with Davenant. Angelo in *The Law Against Lovers* has a bare twenty-five lines to speak before his first scene with Isabella, and these lines are hardly indicative of his character. Most of them are answers to questions, mere acquiescences.<sup>3</sup> In this Davenant again agrees with Whetstone, whose deputy seems honest enough at first, but fails utterly to show any serious moral bent, any particular moral sensitiveness, in the early scenes.

That Davenant could easily have known the works of Whetstone is hardly questionable. There was, besides the play itself, three editions of Whetstone's *Heptameron of Civil Discourses*—two in February 1582 and one in 1593, the latter being known as *Aurelia: The Paragon of Pleasure and Princely Delights*—each of which carried the Promos and Cassandra story.

These considerations point to Davenant's familiarity with Whetstone's story, as well as with Shakespeare's, and thus excuse him, to some degree at least, from shouldering all the responsibility for "debasement" his godfather's play.<sup>4</sup>

THOMAS B. STROUP.

<sup>1</sup> See *The Dramatic Works of William Davenant*, Edinburgh and London, 1874, vol. v, pp. 188-89, and Students' Facsimile edition of George Whetstone's *Right Excellent and famous Historie of Promos and Cassandra*, London, 1578.

<sup>2</sup> *Measure for Measure*, I, i; II, i, ii.

<sup>3</sup> *Law Against Lovers*, I, i; II, i.

<sup>4</sup> There are two other matters that seem to serve as connections between Davenant and Whetstone. The first is the similarity in their criticism. Both denounced the use of the supernatural and of extravagances in literature, Davenant in his dedicatory epistle to *Gondibert* and Whetstone in his dedicatory epistle to *Promos and Cassandra*. Davenant, of course, was catering to friend Hobbes's philosophy in his epistle, but he may have had the literary precedent of Whetstone in mind also. The second matter relates to the scene of Davenant's play. He lays the action at Turin rather than at Vienna, as Shakespeare had done, or at Julio, as Whetstone had done. This change may possibly be explained by the fact that Whetstone's name became associated with Turin after he had there challenged a Spaniard to a duel—a challenge that went unaccepted. Consult *D.N.B.*, xx, p. 1362.

## NOTES ON SIR FRANCIS KYNASTON

THERE are two confusions in the standard accounts of Sir Francis Kynaston, the seventeenth-century poet and courtier, one concerning his life and the other the date of the edition of *Leoline and Sydanis* and *Cynthiades*.

Briefly, the first error is the identification of him with a person of the same name who graduated from Cambridge, was incorporated M.A. at Oxford in 1611, was a rector in Suffolk, and held the offices of taxor and proctor at Cambridge, and was junior and senior bursar at Trinity College there. The error begins in Wood's *Athenae Oxonienses*, with the assumption that it was Sir Francis the poet who was incorporated at Oxford in 1611, and Foster in *Alumni Oxonienses* and the *D.N.B.* add the other details of his namesake's career. But the career of the Cambridge man forms a consistent whole from his entry as a sizar at Trinity in 1602, a year after Sir Francis entered at Oriel College, Oxford. He took his B.A. in 1605 a year after Sir Francis took his at Oxford, and in 1608 was elected a Fellow of his college, from whence he was incorporated M.A. at Oxford. Thereafter his name appears in the records of his first University and College as taxor in 1623, junior bursar at Trinity, 1625-1627, proctor in 1634, senior bursar, 1634-1637, and tutor from 1638 till his death in 1641.

During this period Sir Francis the poet was well occupied elsewhere. The Admission Register of Lincoln's Inn records his entry there in 1604, and a manuscript dedication to him by John Glanvill in Bodleian MS. Ashmole 45, (4), makes it certain that in 1605 he was resident there. In January 1618/19 Sir Francis was knighted—there is no title in the records of the Cambridge Kynaston—and in 1621 became an M.P. when his namesake was a rector in Suffolk. There are several autobiographical references to the "long expense" of his "time and means" at the court of Charles I, when he is supposed to have been a junior bursar; and in 1635, when his London academy came into being and filled his already busy life, it is hardly credible that he was simultaneously elected to manage "all the estates and external property" of a Cambridge college. But for the easy initial mistake of Wood, no one would have confused careers so diverse as those of Sir Francis the poet, and of the Cambridge sizar.

The second point is the date of the edition of *Leoline and*

*Sydanis* and *Cynthiades*. In Bliss's edition of *Athenæ Oxonienses*, Peck cites only an edition of 1646, and argues therefrom that Wood's conjecture that Kynaston died in 1642 must be questionable. However, the 1646 title-page speaks of Sir Francis, "late" of the court, and further, this is not an edition at all, but merely a re-issue of the 1642 edition with a fresh inner title-page with the above correction.

Ellis (*Specimens Early Eng. Poets*, iii, 265) refers to a 1641 edition, but I have found no trace of this. Perhaps he was remembering the imprimatur at the end of the volume which is dated "Maii 22, 1641." The *D.N.B.* uses Ellis to support a suggestion that *Cynthiades* was published earlier in a separate volume; but the *Cynthiades* of 1642 cannot be the sheets of an earlier edition bound up with *Leoline* and *Sydanis* as the paper and type are the same throughout. Further, the two works were registered together as one volume and the preface preceding *Leoline* and *Sydanis* suggests that *Cynthiades* was being printed for the first time. It would seem that this 1642 edition was the only one ever published.

H. G. SECCOMBE.

#### ELIZABETH SMOLLETT, DAUGHTER OF TOBIAS SMOLLETT

THOSE who have read the letters of Tobias Smollett will remember the profound grief which found expression in his correspondence<sup>1</sup> in 1763 over the untimely death of his daughter Elizabeth; and in April of that year, Smollett's friends in London and Chelsea must have been saddened when they saw in the *St. James's Chronicle* (April 5-7) the following note among the obituaries: "Sunday, April 3, at her father's House at Chelsea, aged 15, Miss Elizabeth Smollett, Daughter of Dr. Smollett." Very little is known of Elizabeth Smollett. Letters which she may have written have not survived; no elegies or allusions to her personality seem to have appeared at the time of her decease. If there were portraits of her or of her mother, Ann Smollett, no one knows at present where they may be found. What little information we have, however, points very clearly to the fact that this daughter of a celebrated genius

<sup>1</sup> *The Letters of Tobias Smollett, M.D.*, ed. E. S. Noyes, Harvard University Press, 1926. See Letters 60 and 62.

was hers  
and relat  
are here

Eliza  
1748, p  
the pari  
has com  
grandm  
live wit  
death.

"Also  
said Ar  
Age of  
mean  
the sun  
House

Tham  
strenu  
probal

Mrs.  
daugh  
This  
Wilke

this  
were  
schoo  
altho  
auth

(  
amo

1  
in L

was  
a

year  
you  
of y

Ch

i, 8

was herself a person of unusual promise. Therefore, from scattered and relatively inaccessible sources the fragile fragments of her history are here for the first time collected.

Elizabeth Smollett of Scotch and Creole ancestry was born in 1748, probably when the Smolletts resided at Beaufort Street <sup>1</sup> in the parish of St. Clement Danes, London. No record of her baptism has come to light. It is likely that she was named after her maternal grandmother, Mrs. Elizabeth Leaver, who came from Jamaica to live with the Smolletts in Chelsea at least ten years before Elizabeth's death. In Mrs. Leaver's will <sup>2</sup> there is the following provision: "Also I give unto my Granddaughter Elizabeth the daughter of the said Ann Smollett the sum of two hundred pounds sterling at her Age of twenty one years and I will that the Interest thereof be in the mean time applied towards her Maintenance and Education." In the summer of 1750 the Smolletts moved from London to Monmouth House, Chelsea, and there close by the old church and the quiet Thames Elizabeth passed her childhood, while her father led his strenuous and most versatile literary life. About 1758 she was probably attending a school for girls in Chelsea kept by a Mrs. Aykesworth and a Madame Beete, for John Wilkes <sup>3</sup> sent his daughter there upon Smollett's recommendation of that institution. This we know from Dr. John Armstrong's correspondence <sup>4</sup> with Wilkes. Since Wilkes and Smollett were on very good terms at this period, it is likely that Polly Wilkes and Elizabeth Smollett were congenial friends. How long she may have attended this school is not known. Nor is the precise cause of her death clear, although Robert Chambers stated, <sup>5</sup> probably on good traditional authority, <sup>6</sup> that she was "carried off . . . by consumption."

Concerning her personality a rather definite tradition exists among the biographers of Smollett. Anderson <sup>7</sup> characterised her

<sup>1</sup> For Smollett's residences in London, see my article, "Smollett's Early Years in London," in the *Journal of English and German Philology*, April 1932.

<sup>2</sup> Mrs. Leaver's will (recorded at Somerset House, London, "Cæsar 883") was written at Chelsea, July 25, 1753.

<sup>3</sup> See Horace Bleackley's *Life of John Wilkes*, London, 1917, p. 47.

<sup>4</sup> Add. MSS. (British Museum) 30,875 f. 28. From London, August 12 (no year) Armstrong wrote to John Wilkes: "Dr. Smollett told me that the school you directed me to enquire about was a very reputable one and that a great number of young Ladies of the first fashion in England were educated there."

<sup>5</sup> See *Smollett: His Life and a Selection From His Writings*, by Robert Chambers, 1867, p. 122.

<sup>6</sup> See Thomas Faulkner's *History of Chelsea*, London, 1810, p. 400.

<sup>7</sup> *The Miscellaneous Works of Tobias Smollett, M.D.*, 6 vols., Edinburgh, 1820, i, 83.

as possessing "amiable dispositions and elegant accomplishments, the solace of his [Smollett's] cares, and the object of his fondest affections and fairest hopes." This characterisation is largely a paraphrase of a similar statement made earlier by Smollett's friend and biographer, Dr. Moore.<sup>1</sup> Probably we shall never know the exact nature of her "elegant accomplishments," but Francesco Pera, the Italian physician who attended Smollett during his final illness in Italy, among other notes concerning his distinguished patient recorded the information that his daughter wrote poetry.<sup>2</sup> There is no good reason for doubting this tradition.

That Lydia Melford in *The Expedition of Humphry Clinker* might be a portrait of Elizabeth Smollett was suggested about a century ago by Robert Chambers,<sup>3</sup> who declared :

"There can be little doubt that Matthew Bramble was intended for himself.—Jerry Melford was a picture of his sister's son, Major Telfer.—'Liddy' was his own daughter, who was destined by her friends to marry the Major, but died, to the inexpressible grief of her father, before that scheme was accomplished."

Only in a very general sense, I think, can this identification be accepted ; Lydia's delight over Bath is expressed, of course, in words which might well have been written by Elizabeth in possibly similar circumstances.

Old Chelsea, which Smollett came to regard "as a Second native Place,"<sup>4</sup> exists only in those charming contemporary prints carefully preserved at the Chelsea Public Library. Smollett's Monmouth House has long since disappeared. But Old Chelsea Church remains, and is for many reasons a shrine of interest for one who visits Chelsea to-day. In the middle aisle of this church, near the spot where the font originally stood, one reads on the worn stone :

Elizabeth Leaver <sup>5</sup>  
Ob Decr 6, 1762  
Aetat 71

<sup>1</sup> *The Works of Tobias Smollett, M.D.*, ed. John Moore, 8 vols., London, 1797, i, clxvii.

<sup>2</sup> *Curiosita Livornesi, Inedite o Rare*, Livorno, 1888, p. 316. The note in question reads : "E vissuto con la moglie 18 [sic] anni in perfetta armonia ; dalla quale ottenne una figlia che poetava."

<sup>3</sup> *Traditions of Edinburgh*, Edinburgh, 1825, 2 vols., i, 274.

<sup>4</sup> See *Letters*, ed. Noyes, p. 84.

<sup>5</sup> See *Chelsea Old Church*, by Randall Davies, London, 1904, p. 248, for the following : "Middle aisle north side near Font 'Elizabeth Lewer [sic], ob. Decr. 6, 1762 Aetat 71."

And there beneath the same stone<sup>1</sup> rest the ashes of Elizabeth Smollett, buried, a few months later, on April 11, 1763.<sup>2</sup>

It would be most appropriate if some memorial of Tobias Smollett and his daughter might be set up in Chelsea. There is at present nothing to remind the visitor that the famous novelist resided there, and whatever inscription may have marked the grave of his daughter in Old Chelsea Church has been completely obliterated by time.

LEWIS MANSFIELD KNAPP.

### JOHNSON'S JOURNEY, 1775

MORE than ten years ago, on a clue furnished by Mr. S. C. Roberts, I distinguished two editions of the *Journey to the Western Islands* with identical title pages dated 1775. The booksellers persist in calling these first and second issue, though I have pointed out that the text was corrected and reset. I have now acquired a third edition, which as it is intermediate between the two others I will call *b*.

*a* has two cancel-leaves, signed D8 and \*U4. It has also an errata page which in 12 lines corrects 11 errors.

*b* follows *a* almost, though not quite, page for page and line for line, but was I think almost entirely reset. It has, naturally, no cancels, but it retains the 11 errors and the 12-line errata page. This inadvertence suggests haste. On the other hand it introduces, in the earlier sheets, a number of changes clearly due to the author (see the notes to my edition of 1924). To distinguish the editions, *b* has starred signatures (starred on the first leaf only of each sheet). A few stars were omitted by inadvertence.

*c* follows the revised text of *b*. The first 6 errors again persisted, but the oversight was detected in time for the remainder to be altered in type. *c* accordingly corrects 6 errors by a 6-line errata-page. It seems to be largely, though not entirely, printed from the type of *b*. The signatures are again starred, but not quite

<sup>1</sup> For this information I am greatly obliged to Mr. Reginald Blount, the well-known historian of Chelsea, who informs me that a sexton's Book of Burials of Old Chelsea Church, in his possession, has the following entry under April 11, 1763: "Miss Elizabeth Smollett under Mrs. Leavers Flat Stone in the Middle Isle."

<sup>2</sup> At St. Luke's, Chelsea, the burial of Elizabeth Smollett is recorded in the register under the date of April 11, 1763.

as in *b*; e.g. the first sheet of *b* is signed \*B, but the first sheet of *c* is signed B.

Although *b* has not hitherto been detected, it need not be very rare; for any copy with the 12-line *errata* would be described by the booksellers as "first issue." But it must be scarce, for I have examined a great many copies, and I never before found one with starred signatures and the 12-line *errata*. We know that Johnson was anxious to correct any errors of fact that might be pointed out; and I conjecture that Strahan printed a very small second edition and kept the type standing in expectation of further corrections which never came; Johnson lost interest, and failed even to correct the mistakes which Boswell quickly pointed out.

Johnson said "they printed four thousand." I doubt if more were printed in 1775. The book is common, but not excessively common. I guess that the figure four thousand covers *a*, *b*, and *c*, and that the numbers were about 2,000, 500 (or even 250), and 1,500.

R. W. CHAPMAN.

#### FURTHER NOTES FOR A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF COWPER'S LETTERS

THE following notes are supplementary to my article in the *Review of English Studies* for April 1931 (vii, 182-7), in which I attempted to complete Mr. Thomas Wright's edition of Cowper's correspondence by giving references to letters printed elsewhere and by offering suggestions for the placing of undated or incorrectly dated ones.

##### ABRIDGED REFERENCES

###### *Correction*

Hayley (1806). For 2nd edition read New edition.

##### TABLE OF LETTERS

###### *Corrections*

67.1 (footnote). For 17, and 1770 read and 17, 1770.

610 Read 610.1.

902 For Oct. 20 read Oct. 28.

## Additions

- 67.05 1770, March 11, Newton } H.P. Stokes, *Cowper Memorials*, 1904,  
 67.2 1770, March 14, " } pp. 132, 134, 135.  
 67.3 1770, March 17, " }  
 195.1 1781, Sept. 3. Joseph Johnson. *Observer*, June 7, 1931.

The date of this extract has been kindly communicated by Mr. Thomas Wright.

- 377.1 1784, Dec. 31. Robert Smith. *Saturday Review of Literature*, November 28, 1931.

- 482.1 *n.d.* Unwin.

This outline of an assize sermon to be preached by William Unwin is printed in Bruce's Aldine edition of Cowper's poems, 1866, i, clxxii. It must be recorded here, since it ends "Yours, W.C.," and has evidently been detached from a lost letter. I cannot suggest a date for it, and follow Mr. Wright's example by placing it provisionally about the date of Unwin's death.

- 596.2 1788, Dec. 16. Lady Throckmorton. *Observer*, June 7, 1931.

- 631.1 [1789], Sept. 10. "Mr. Urban." *Gentleman's Magazine*, lx, 801.

Cowper writes to Lady Hesketh on March 12, 1791, "Thou mayst remember perhaps that long since (not less I suppose than a year and a half) I sent some ridiculous queries to the *Gentleman's Magazine*. . . Long time they remained unprinted but at last they appeared and were answered not only in the *Magazine*, but soon after in several newspapers also; but nothing occurred that furnished me with the occasion of wrangling that I had sought. At length, however, in the last *Magazine*, a musty and insipid antiquarian has thought proper to animadvert on the frivolous nature of my queries with an air of great gravity and self-importance. I have accordingly entered the lists; that is to say I have this very morning written and sent to the post a letter to Mr. Urban, complaining of the undue severity of old square toes' stricture, and proving him to be altogether as ignorant and a more frivolous writer than myself."

"Old square toes'" letter may be found in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for February 1791 (lxi, 104), over the signature "E." His censure is aimed chiefly at the enquiries of "Indagator" in the *Magazine* for September 1790 (lx, 801), some of which had already been discussed by other correspondents (lx, 876, 1075, 1086; lxi, 16). "Indagator's" letter is dated September 10, and September 10, 1789, is almost exactly a year and a half before March 12, 1791. "Indagator's," or Cowper's, rejoinder was not printed or even acknowledged.

- 633 —, Oct. 4. Rose. *Times Literary Supplement*, November 19, 1931.

- 819 1792, May 12, Teedon. *Corr.* iv, 203.

This letter is headed "Tuesday, 12 May [1792 perhaps]." But May 12, 1792 was a Saturday. The letter describes a stage

in Mrs. Unwin's recovery from her stroke on May 23, which she reached about the middle of June. Tuesday, June 12, is a possible and probable date. [=843.05]

828 —, June, Teedon. *Corr.* iv, 211

This letter is headed "Tues., noon, probably June 1792." In it Cowper says, "My work [on Milton] is all of a stand, and I have written to tell Johnson that in all appearance it will be impossible for me to be ready at the time." He wrote to Johnson to this effect on July 8, so that the letter to Teedon should be dated Tuesday, July 10. [=854.1]

840 —, June, Teedon. *Corr.* iv, 229.

This letter is headed simply "Saturday Morning." Its position between dated ones of Sunday, June 10, and Monday, June 11, is therefore untenable. Cowper says in it, "It is not always possible for me to write in the instant, and yesterday it was for your sake that I declined it." As he wrote to Teedon on Friday, June 8, June 9 is an impossible date. Teedon notes in his diary<sup>1</sup> on Friday, July 27, "I writ to day . . . & desired an ans<sup>r</sup> but as I rec<sup>d</sup> none I writ again." Next day he writes, "I rec<sup>d</sup> a note from the Esq<sup>r</sup>." No. 840 may be assigned to this date, July 28, with reasonable certainty. [=864.1]

843.05 —. See 819.

845.1 —. See 852.

852 —, June, Teedon. *Corr.* iv, 246.

The date of this letter is shown to be Monday, June 18, by Teedon's entry in his diary for that day, "The Esq<sup>r</sup> writ me word that Mad<sup>m</sup> walked alone 4 times yesterday in Orchard walk!" [=845.1]

852.1 — [July 2], Teedon.

The original of this undated and apparently unpublished letter is in the British Museum, inserted in a copy of Hayley's *Life and Letters of Cowper*, 1809, vol. 1 (press-mark C.60.1.8). It can be dated by the entry in Teedon's diary for Monday, July 2, 1792, "I rec<sup>d</sup> a Note from the Esq<sup>r</sup> of his receiv<sup>g</sup> Mr. Newton with joy & a recollection of Joy under his ministry." The text is as follows:

DEAR SIR—

Your prayer that Mr. Newton's coming might be blest to me, was answer'd before it was made. He was here on Saturday Morning and I received him with more spiritual affection than I have felt these 5 years; received him with a lively recollection of the comforts which God, in years past, had dispens'd to me under his ministry.

Your pray'rs also for M<sup>rs</sup>. Unwin are, I hope, in a way to be answer'd. Her strength returns daily, and though her complete

<sup>1</sup> *The Diary of Samuel Teedon*, edited by Thomas Wright, 1902.

recovery must be a work of time, there is reason from present appearances to hope That time will come.

I am Sir Yours

W<sup>m</sup> COWPER.

[Endorsed] To M<sup>r</sup>. Teedon.

854.1 —, See 828.

864.1 —, See 840.

887 —, Sept., Teedon. *Corr.* iv, 296.

The date is shown to be September 26 by the entry for that day in Teedon's diary, "I rec<sup>d</sup> a Note from the Esq<sup>r</sup> inform<sup>s</sup> me next Monday he purposes to begin his Dissertations."

911 —, Nov. 17, Teedon. *Corr.* iv, 324.

The heading as printed, "Nov. 17 [?1792]," is needlessly cautious, since Cowper speaks of "Friday, Nov. 16" and "Saturday 17," showing that 1792 is certainly the year.

995.1 1793, Sept. 10, General Cowper.

A. J. Symington, *The Poet of Home Life*, [1901], p. 103.

KENNETH POVEY.

## REVIEWS

**A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue.** By Sir WILLIAM A. CRAIGIE. Part I, A—Assemble. The University of Chicago Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1931. Pp. xi+120. 21s. net.

SIR WILLIAM CRAIGIE, having played his full part in the main enterprise of the *Oxford English Dictionary*, is now busy with other lexicographical projects and a cordial welcome must be extended to the firstfruits of his labours upon a dictionary of the older Scottish language from the end of the twelfth to the end of the seventeenth century.

In its form the dictionary follows, with various minor improvements of arrangement and typography, the lines of its great forerunner, and, though published in Chicago, it is actually printed at the Oxford Press.

The Oxford Dictionary by no means neglected the older Scottish tongue in the collecting and printing of its material, but the new dictionary can allow itself ampler scope in the treatment of many of the words for, by its chronological limitations, it is freed from any necessity to handle that vast mass of modern coinages which threaten to make the task of the modern lexicographer an impossibly heavy one. But not only is there more space for illustration but a large mass of new material has been brought to light, largely from cartularies, Burgh records, legal documents of every kind, diaries and household books printed and unprinted, with the result that many articles are greatly expanded and many are entirely new.

The larger measure of space has been used for recording under separate headings the more important of the variants of common words used in early Scottish. Thus the common English *eleven* is fully illustrated alike under *alevin* and *elevin*, *ambassador* under *ambassadour* and *ambaxatour*, *ensign* under *ansenze* and *ensenze* (not to mention *antsingye* and *handsenze*), *upon* under unstressed *apon* and fully stressed *upon*.

It has naturally been used also for fuller illustration of words which have some special Scottish sense-development. This is

specially the case with terms in legal use, *e.g.* *accession*, "the action of being an accessory," *actitate* (not found in English), "entered on a record as under some bond or obligation," *affirme*, "to fence a court," *annuellar*, "one who receives an annual rent." Fuller treatment is also given to certain characteristically Scottish adverbial expressions such as *agateward(s)*, *anerly*, *allanerly*, *allutterly*, and to common words like *affeir*, *affere*, vb. and sb., which develop on lines entirely of their own in the Scottish vernacular.

Some of the new words remind us of the readiness with which Scottish speech has always assimilated Latinisms, *e.g.* *abscede* (cut off), *agnosce* (acknowledge), *affectuate* (affected), *amene* (pleasant), and shown itself equally ready to adopt Gallicisms, *e.g.* *abrico* (apricot), *allavolie* (at random), *applesaunce* (consent), *argentie* (a silver fabric), *allacay* (from O. Fr. *alacays*, the earliest form of the difficult word *lackey*).

Unluckily an unduly large proportion of the words dealt with in this part are, by reason of the initial letter, necessarily of learned origin and one gets but few glimpses of characteristically popular words or phrases: *acher*, "ear of corn," *adest*, "on this side of," *alleris* and *aneris*, curious double genitival forms from O.E. *ealra* and *ānra*, *alset*, "although," *ankleth*, "the ankle-joint," *arffe*, an Orkney and Shetland legal term for division of inherited property, are among the few examples to be found, none of which is recorded in the *O.E.D.*

Specially Scottish forms of familiar words naturally receive full treatment, *e.g.* the curiously frequent forms *a(c)k* and *abstra(c)k* for the vbs. *act* and *abstract*, the common Scottish *almous* for *alms* (including *almoser* for *almoner*) and the unexplained *argoun* for *argue*.

There is not much that is of interest from the purely etymological point of view. The *O.E.D.* etymology of *a(i)rt*, "quarter of the wind," deriving that word from Gaelic *aird*, *ard*, "top, point," is dismissed without comment, but no alternative is suggested. The most interesting note of this kind is that on *Arthurishufe* or *oon*, used variously of an old round building which formerly stood near Carron (first referred to in the year 1292), and of the constellation Arcturus. It is shown that the proper form is *Arthuris-oune* or "Arthur's oven" (cf. the early Latin rendering as *furnus Arthuri*).

The first part of this new dictionary shows alike how much such a dictionary was needed and how excellently it has been planned and inaugurated.

ALLEN MAWER.

**English and Norse Documents: Relating to the Reign of Ethelred the Unready.** By MARGARET ASHDOWN, M.A. Cambridge University Press. 1930. Pp. xiv+311. 16s. net.

THE nucleus of this volume is an edition of the Old English *Battle of Maldon*, and an attempt to estimate the literary and historical value of the poem. The author, however, found that the poem could not be studied alone, apart from its proper setting, and has therefore included in the book illustrative material from other sources, namely, the annals of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (C text), 978 to 1017, three Norse skaldic poems and passages from Norse sagas. Had the book been planned by an historian twenty years ago, the Norse authorities would, almost certainly, have been subordinated to the *Historia Eliensis* and the *Encomium Emmae*, but to-day the peculiar function and worth of Norse records, as authorities for English history, is being recognised: Miss Ashdown in her able Introductions sets forth their claim for recognition. She justifies Snorri Sturluson's high valuation of skaldic verse as a basis for Norse historical writing, disposes of Vigfússon's heresy and draws attention to the fact that the poems she includes (*Ólafsdrápa*, *Knútsdrápa*, *Liðsmannaflakkr*) contain "no small amount of clear and definite statement." The sagas, however, have exhausted the patience of English historians who have tried to reconcile, for example, the Norse accounts of St. Olaf's activities in England with the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, and to discover truth behind the inventions and elaborations of the *Flateyjarbók*. Miss Ashdown gives due place to such problems in her notes, setting out the issues with masterly ease. But, at the same time, she realises that "accuracy or definiteness in genealogy, chronology, and topography . . . forms only one aspect of historical truthfulness. While the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* records events as they pass across the stage of history year by year, and only rarely attempts to sum up characters or to deal with larger issues, the sagas preserve, with a consistency which carries conviction of their essential trustworthiness, the memory of personalities, scenes and movements." Viewed from this standpoint, the extract from *Gunnlaugssaga*, recounting the Iclander's visit to the court of Ethelred the Unready, is of great value and interest. It is curious to find the scapegoat king described as *góðr hofðingi*: although this may be a conventional way of introducing him, or refer, more especially, to his generosity to Gunnlaugr, it is significant that

"Nor  
note

T  
schol  
transl  
be de  
the p  
chan  
been  
early  
same  
draw  
Engl  
are d  
A  
cont  
topo  
mon

Ellie

Bo  
atte  
acc

"Norse authorities"—to quote the beginning of Miss Ashdown's note—"make no reference to Ethelred's incompetence."

The texts, both Anglo-Saxon and Norse, are all edited with scholarly care and acumen: the author has provided admirable translations to face. The edition of the *Battle of Maldon* will surely be definitive; its introduction takes account of all the problems of the poem and glances at the question of "whether the poem is a chance survivor of a group of lost poems, which would, had they been preserved, have shown us the line of development from the early heroic poetry to this late but authentic representative of the same type." One interesting feature of the notes is the attention drawn to the re-occurrence of some of the phraseology in Middle-English and Norse poetry; the metre and phonology of the poem are discussed into two appendices.

At the end of the volume, there are two valuable indexes which contain not mere page references, but a wealth of biographical<sup>1</sup> and topographical information, critically sifted, bearing eloquent testimony to Miss Ashdown's careful scholarship.

G. N. G.

**Elliott Monographs in the Romance Languages and Literatures.** Edited by EDWARD C. ARMSTRONG. Princeton University Press; Les Presses Universitaires de France.

19. The Authorship of the *Vengement Alixandre* and of the *Venjançe Alixandre*, by Edward C. Armstrong. 1926. Pp. xiii+55. \$1 (4s. 6d.).
20. A Classification of the Manuscripts of Gui de Cambrai's *Vengement Alixandre*. By Bateman Edwards. 1926. Pp. vii+51. 80 cents (4s.).
27. Jehan le Névelon, *La Venjançe Alixandre*. Edited by Edward Billings Ham. 1931. Pp. lxvi+126. \$2 (10s.).
26. Antonio Pucci, *Le Noie*. Edited with an Introduction by Kenneth McKenzie. 1931. Pp. clxii+101. \$2.50 (12s. 6d.).

BOTH the *Vengement Alixandre* and the *Venjançe Alixandre* are attempts at completing the narrative of the *Roman d'Alexandre*, with accounts of how the peers went in search of the traitors who had

<sup>1</sup> *Re Maccus*, see *Year's Work in English Studies*, vol. v, p. 76.

poisoned Alexander, overcame them, and put them to death : Gui de Cambrai is the author of the *Vengement*, Jean le Névelon of the *Venjançe*. They worked independently of each other. In the first of the above-mentioned monographs, Professor E. C. Armstrong marshals all the evidence in favour of the identification of the Gui de Cambrai of the *Vengement* with the author of Barlaam and Josaphat. This latter poem was composed between 1186 and 1202 ; the former before 1191. There is an abundant explanation in their dissimilar antecedent models for all stylistic differences. As for the author of the *Venjançe*, Professor Armstrong supplies numerous reasons in favour of his identification of Jean, son of Névelon the Marshal ; this version was composed just before the death of Henry I de Champagne in 1181. In the second of the monographs recorded above, Mr. Bateman Edwards studies the manuscript relations of the *Vengement*, and concludes by maintaining that H (Paris, BNF 786, f° 84 v°, col. 1-91 v°, col. 2) should be used as the basic manuscript in an edition. F (Parma, Bib. Palatina 1206, f° 173 r°-190 v°), which had not been closely examined before, is shown by Mr. Edwards to be a fusion of the *Venjançe* with the *Vengement*. The text of the *Venjançe* is now published in a critical edition, with a detailed examination of the language, by Dr. Edward Billings Ham (Elliott Monograph 27, being a revision of the first half of a doctoral dissertation accepted in 1927 at the University of Oxford).

Mr. Kenneth Mackenzie's critical edition of Antonio Pucci's *Noie* is accompanied with abundant illustrative material, among which a chapter devoted to the history of the word *noia* and related words in Italian and other languages is worth notice for its general interest. Another valuable chapter, on the *noie* as a literary form, finds analogues to this practically extinct literary genre in the "Blues" of the present century American negroes, and in isolated compositions like Lewis Carroll's *Sea Dirge* (1861).

MARIO PRAZ.

### English Writings of Richard Rolle, Hermit of Hampole.

Edited by HOPE EMILY ALLEN. Oxford : Clarendon Press.  
1931. 64+180. 7s. 6d. net.

FIVE years ago, after over twenty years' work on the subject, Miss Allen published her exhaustive investigation of the Rolle canon.

As with Wyclif, so many and such varied productions have, from early times, been associated with Rolle's name, that, in the general uncertainty as to what was really his, it was impossible to form any clear idea of either his personality or his literary style. And though actually, as Miss Allen says, "the canon of Rolle is exceptionally well established," almost no uncertainties entering into it, it was her study that, by establishing this, first made possible an edition of Rolle's works that one could accept with confidence. It is a great pleasure to have a selection of Rolle's English writings from Miss Allen herself.

This little book is very welcome, and all the more so as Horstmann's valuable collection of texts, containing practically everything except the *Psalter*, is now scarce, and apart from these two volumes Rolle's works are accessible only in scattered editions of very unequal value. The great advantage of the present volume, which "gives texts in full or in part of practically all Rolle's English writings" arranged in chronological order, is that here one can at last view Rolle's complete range as a writer of English, from the *Psalter*, probably his first English work, to the mature *Epistles* of his prime, by which "it is right that Rolle should finally be judged both for doctrine and style."

The volume opens with an Introduction in which Miss Allen gives an excellent sketch of Rolle's life and mysticism, founded of course on her earlier book, to which this is a pendant. As is natural, therefore, "reasons are there given for much which is here stated positively; and in a few cases a slight possibility of doubt which is there noted is here suppressed. But the chapters in literary history concerned with Rolle's English works have naturally been carried farther here than in the other book. . . ." As it is from Rolle's own works that we learn so much of what we know about him, Miss Allen quotes extensively (in translation) from his Latin writings, particularly the *Canticles*, the *Incendium*, and the *Melum*; and sentences are also gathered together out of the long *English Psalter* (of which only a short extract is given in the texts), as this contains "the most characteristic expressions of his popular message."

The texts open with twelve pages from the *English Psalter*, which is followed by the two versions of the *Meditation on the Passion*; eight lyrics (including the short prose-poem *Gastly Gladnesse*); two short prose pieces, the well-known *Bee* and *Desyre and Delit*; and the three English *Epistles*, *Ego Dormio*, *The Commandment*,

and *The Form of Living*. Each of these is preceded by a short critical note. The texts are edited from (rotographs of) single MSS., collation with other MSS. being done from Horstmann's edition.<sup>1</sup> Miss Allen addresses her edition not, at least primarily, to students of philology, but to "students both of literary history and of religious history," many of whom "will be unacquainted with Middle English"; and these readers are advised to "keep in mind the peculiarities of Scottish and read any doubtful passages aloud." A "simple" glossary (of sixteen pages) is provided, page-references not being given except sporadically. Finally, there are forty-three pages of most valuable Notes, giving, besides explanations of difficulties, information about sources and comments on the subject-matter and on Rolle's style and linguistic peculiarities.

It is becoming a commonplace now to congratulate the Clarendon Press on its productions. This is a most attractive little book, bound in dark blue cloth and printed beautifully on excellent paper.

W. A. G. D.-D.

**The Shepherd's Calendar.** By EDMUND SPENSER. Complete Works, Vol. III, edited by W. L. Renwick. The Scholartis Press. 1930. Pp. viii+244. 8s. 6d. net.

THIS edition of *The Shepherd's Calendar* forms the third volume of the Complete Works of Spenser, upon which Professor Renwick is engaged. He has here a more interesting text for his commentary than in the earlier volumes, *Complaints* and *Daphnida*; the result leaves us with a faint sense of disappointment. Professor Renwick does not tackle the problem of Spenser's language in *The Shepherd's Calendar*, the *provenance* of the dialect forms, the varying linguistic texture so deftly and deliberately handled by the poet. He gives careful attention to the metrical experiments, but leaves the issues confused by following the stereotyped convention of reckoning the line by syllables. Now Spenser at this time was trying experiments with free-moving stress rhythms, and his lines must often be defined, not by numbering the syllables but by stresses. Professor Renwick writes thus of the *August Roundelay*: "The norm is a verse of eight syllables followed by replies of five and seven alternately,

<sup>1</sup> I have noticed only one misprint not noted in the Corrigenda: *pyne* for *pyne* on p. 46, l. 60. On p. xx, l. 7 from end, a "p" has dropped out.

which might make a stanza of 8, 5, 8, 7, cross-rhymed"—surely not a satisfactory description of such lines as these :

As the bonilasse passed bye,  
hey ho bonilasse,  
She roude at me with glauncing eye,  
as cleare as the christall glasse :

Spenser is experimenting with 4-stress lines, getting variety by an alternate spacing out and hurrying of syllables, and most certainly exploiting the charms of triple, or anapaestic rhythms. Again in the famous *April* lay, Professor Renwick misses what is the subtlest element in that elaborate metrical triumph, the change from "iambic" to "anapaestic" or triple rhythm in the progress of the poem.

We begin regularly enough :

Ye daynty Nymphs, that in this blessed Brooke  
doe bathe your brest,

But the extra syllables begin to play in the third stanza, "Cān yōu well cōmpāre"; and by the last stanza we are in full anapaestic swing :

Now ryse up *Elisa*, decked as thou art,  
in royall aray ;  
And now ye daintie Damsells may depart  
echeone her way,  
I feare, I have troubled your troupes to longe :

Professor Renwick touches only lightly on the autobiographical evidence in the *Shepherd's Calendar*. He is vague and general in his remarks about the time and place of its composition. The following dates should be set down in order :

February 1578. Dr. Young became Bishop of Rochester.

In 1578 Spenser was his Secretary.

April 10, 1579. E. K. completed his Preface to the *Shepherd's Calendar*.

October 16, 1579. Spenser wrote to Harvey from Leicester House.

December 5th, 1579. The *Shepherd's Calendar* was licensed.

The point should be plainly made that Spenser was in all probability at Rochester in the employ of the Bishop when he wrote *The Shepherd's Calendar*, whose "moral eclogues" reflect (perhaps more fully than is good for the poetry) the ecclesiastical politics of Dr. Young. It is worth pointing out that, among the many allusions to the Kentish countryside, the lines in *July* :

The salt Medway, that trickling stremis  
adowne the dales of Kent :  
Till with his elder brother Themis  
His brackish waues be meynt.

have a special local aptness when we think of Spenser at Rochester, where the Medway flows into the Thames.

We do not think Professor Renwick establishes his point about the order in which the eclogues were written (Commentary, p. 167); his conjectural order hinges on a shaky assumption, namely, that *November*, because of its astrological allusion to the Fish, must have been written for *February*. The lines with their context (*November*, ll. 9-17) suggest the beginning of the winter rather than the end, and the Fish is probably best explained as a lapse on Spenser's part. If he remembered Chaucer's lines—

Now dauncen lusty Venus children dere,  
For in the Fish hir lady sat ful hye

he could not have written

But nowe sadde Winter welked hath the day,  
And *Phoebus* weary of his yerely taske,  
Ystabled hath his steedes in lowlye laye,  
And taken up his ynne in *Fishes* haske.

Moreover E. K. nails Spenser's error to the mast with his note: "the sonne reigneth, that is, in the signe of Pisces all November."

We do not agree with Professor Renwick that Spenser is "quite untrue to English scenery, flowers, speech and everything else." Spenser does not over-emphasise the seasonal changes month by month, but he knows his English weather, and he gives us as much as we can stand.

In *February* Cuddie cries :

Ah for pittie, wil rancke Winters rage,  
These bitter blasts neuer ginne tasswage ?  
The kene cold blowes through my beaten hyde,  
All as I were through the body gryde.

*November* ends, as it should, with a sullen drizzle :

Now gynnes to mizzle, hye we homeward fast.

With a descriptive touch here and there—the "cocked hay," the "scarlet berries" of the briar—Spenser assures us of the English countryside, though like all Pastoral poets he allows elements to stray into it from the poetical scenery of his predecessors.

Professor Renwick's main work in his commentary is the elucidation of Spenser's and E. K.'s allusions and quotations, and the sketching in of the literary background of the Renaissance behind Spenser's poetic thought and utterance. In this he continues to carry out with scholarly thoroughness and skill a labour which will

give his  
secure p

Marlov  
192

WHEN  
our sc  
admit t  
that an  
its indu  
for test  
this st  
late h  
which  
examin  
that se  
as the  
questi  
Marlo

T  
and s  
"Th  
Work  
Rich  
of E  
even  
Emp  
for l  
Rich  
Ven

poir  
to c  
thro  
har  
dw  
que  
the

give his complete edition of Spenser's *Works* a lasting value, and a secure place on the shelves of scholars.

HELEN DARBISHIRE.

**Marlowe : A Conspectus.** By J. M. ROBERTSON. Routledge. 1931. Pp. vi+186. 6s. net.

WHEN Mr. Robertson speaks of carrying the "scientific spirit" into our scrutiny of problems of authorship, he apparently does not admit that psychological evidence may be scientific in this sense, or that an estimate of a personality made by its aid may be as strict in its inductions as his own criticism and equally severe in its "concern for testable evidence" in another field. So it comes about that, in this study of the Marlowe canon, we are occasionally reminded of a late humourist's description of a well-attended Sunday service at which only God was left outside; in this thorough and careful examination of evidence for authorship, the only source of evidence that seems to escape notice is human nature. It is upon such grounds as these that a reader may differ from Mr. Robertson upon certain questions of date (such as that of *Edward II*) and of the canon of Marlowe's works.

The main part of the book is a discussion of Marlowe's "hand" and some new theories are advanced in Part II, Chapters II and III, "The Assignable Plays in the Folio" and "Assignable Collaborative Work." The first of these groups includes the *Henry VI* plays, *Richard III*, *Henry V* (part), *Julius Cæsar* (part), and *The Comedy of Errors*. The later chapter contains some suggestions perhaps even less anticipated, including the old *King John*, *Alphonse Emperor of Germany*, *The Taming of A Shrew*, *Edward III*, *A Larum for London*, and *Arden of Feversham*, together with the Folio plays, *Richard II*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Titus Andronicus* and *The Merchant of Venice*.

The chapter on Marlowe's genius and character is full of good points and shrewd estimates, such as the study of Marlowe seems to call out in many of those who discipline themselves to "look through his eyes." The happy application of Pater's phrase, "a hard and gem-like flame," to one aspect of the genius of Marlowe, dwells in the memory. Though in a detailed examination one would question certain statements—the anthropomorphic habit of mind, the lack of religion and the innate chivalry with which Marlowe is

endowed—and would, perhaps, question whether more importance might not be attached to the Elizabethan habit of drawing upon common sources of imagery, this part of the book is happily free from that disregard of the psychological evidence which is a disturbing element in Part II.

U. M. ELLIS-FERMOR.

**The Phoenix Nest (1593).** Edited by HYDER EDWARD ROLLINS. Cambridge: Harvard University Press [London: Humphrey Milford]. 1931. Pp. xliii+241. Price \$5.00 (21s. net).

THIS is the fifth, and after Tottell's *Songes and Sonettes* the most interesting, of the Elizabethan poetical miscellanies that Professor Rollins has so far edited. The plan of the work is in general that adopted for his previous reprints—a comprehensive introduction precedes the text of the poems, which are followed by exceedingly full notes and useful indexes. The introductory and explanatory sections are characterised by sound and careful scholarship, and there is little doubt that this edition will remain the standard for many years.

As regards text *The Phoenix Nest* is the easiest to deal with of all the Elizabethan anthologies, as only one edition is known to have been printed, every page of which bears marks of diligent proof-reading and careful press-work. Moreover, the poems as there printed are almost invariably superior in text to the versions found in contemporary books and manuscripts, and of all but three or four *The Phoenix Nest* provides the earliest text known.

In the purity of its texts *The Phoenix Nest* stands in strong contrast to Tottell's *Miscellany*, but in other respects the two collections are so strangely similar that it is not entirely fantastic to regard the later one as in some measure an attempt to do for the followers of Sidney what Tottell's *Miscellany* had done for the school of Wyatt and Surrey forty years before. Both anthologies sought primarily to represent the "new poetry" of their day; and in each case the authors—Lodge and his fellows no less than Wyatt and Surrey and their imitators—were drawing mainly upon French and Italian sources for their inspiration. To this cause also are due the metrical experiments, e.g. sonnets, that constitute a main feature of both collections but are absent from the intervening miscellanies, such as *The Paradise of Dainty Devices*.

Again  
Nest ran  
recent a  
expressi  
have ha  
particul  
Tottell's  
chiefly  
Mo  
in the  
printed  
monop  
quarter  
to gen  
from t  
Sin  
prose  
the c  
gentle  
memb  
by th  
on m  
C  
that  
beari  
has n  
on h  
Smy  
Rich  
trad  
like  
con  
seco  
diff  
to t  
of  
it l  
of  
to  
St

Again, in stressing the gentility of its contributors, *The Phoenix Nest* ranges itself with Tottell's collection rather than with the more recent anthologies. Professor Rollins believes this to have been an expression of the courtier poets' dislike of publicity; it may also have had some connection with the editors' intention to appeal to a particular class of readers. For it is at least possible that both Tottell's *Miscellany* and *The Phoenix Nest* were meant to appeal chiefly to the young men who frequented the Inns of Court.

Most of Tottell's business was done with lawyers—particularly in the early part of his career, when *Songes and Sonettes* was first printed; for he was both a printer and a bookseller; he held the monopoly of printing law books; and his shop was in the legal quarter of the city. He addressed the Preface of *Songes and Sonettes* to gentle and learned readers—presumably his regular customers from the Inns of Court.

Similarly, by placing in the forefront of his volume of poems the prose defence of the Earl of Leicester, entitled *The dead mans Right*, the compiler of *The Phoenix Nest*, "R.S. of the Inner Temple gentleman," was perhaps attempting to enlist the support of the members of his Inn. For Leicester's memory was held in honour by the members of the Inner Temple, as he had taken their part on more than one occasion when their privileges had been threatened.

Concerning the identity of "R.S." Professor Rollins has little that is new to say. His work has value, however, since the facts bearing on the matter are nowhere else collected together. He has no difficulty in disposing of the claims that have been advanced on behalf of Richard Stanyhurst, Robert Southwell and Robert Smythe, and he ably summarises the evidence for and against Richard Smith, Ralph Sadler and Ralph Sidley. Following the traditional view which derives from Thomas Warton, he would like to identify "R.S." with the Richard Stapleton, who in 1593 contributed some prefatory verses to Greene's *Mamillia: The second part*, but recognises that definite proof is lacking. One difficulty is the uncertainty as to the precise meaning to be assigned to the phrase "of the Inner Temple gentleman." In every instance of its occurrence in sixteenth-century records that I have examined it has been possible to show that the man described was a member of the Inner Temple; but there is no record of Stapleton's admission to that society. One would like to be sure of the identity of this Stapleton and George Chapman's "most ancient, learned, and right

noble friend, *M. Richard Stapilton*, first most desertfull mouer in the frame of our *Homer*." Professor Rollins makes an attractive case for attributing the translation of *Phillis and Flora* to this friend of Chapman's, although it was first printed in 1595 under Chapman's name. He quotes a note of Joseph Hunter's to the effect that Chapman's friend was probably Richard Stapleton of Carlton, Yorkshire, father of Sir Robert Stapleton, the dramatist and translator of Juvenal. This clue might be worth following up, for the grandfather and great-uncle of this Richard Stapleton were members of the Inner Temple.<sup>1</sup>

In his discussion of the claims of Robert Sackville, son of the author of the *Induction to A Mirror for Magistrates*, Professor Rollins again hardly allows sufficiently for the possibility of a connection between *The Phoenix Nest* and the Inner Temple. Sackville had been educated by Ascham and retained throughout his life an interest in learning and poetry. He was at Oxford from 1576 to 1579, and among his contemporaries there were Matthew Roydon, George Peele, Thomas Lodge, and Richard Eedes—all of whom contributed to *The Phoenix Nest*. In 1580 Sackville was admitted to the Inner Temple, of which his father was a member and his grandfather had been a governor. His father, Lord Buckhurst, had been associated with the Earl of Leicester during the two years immediately before the latter's death. These facts, together with the prominence given in *The Phoenix Nest* to *The dead mans Right*, tell slightly in favour of Sackville as editor, although there is at present no evidence to connect him with any of the known contributors. A detailed discussion of Sackville's claim would have been more useful to students than Professor Rollins's protracted exposure of the editorial misdemeanours of Payne Collier.

The Introduction covers a good deal of ground. Following the sections on the editing and origin of the work consideration is given to the subjects of the poems. There are also discussions on the style and metre, and on the later fame of the work, as well as criticisms of the methods of its nineteenth-century editors. The traditional attributions of the initials that are appended to about one-third of the poems are judiciously reviewed; and the importance, from the point of view of quality as well as quantity, of Lodge's contribution receives attention.

<sup>1</sup> See also Close Rolls, 31 Eliz., Part 28 (P.R.O. C54/1333), for a possible connection of Richard Stapleton of Carlton with the Temple.

The text of this reprint follows the original edition page for page, line for line, and type for type, and has been very carefully prepared.

The notes are very full. They contain valuable information about the French and Italian models and sources of many of the poems. They include also collations of other texts and explanations of difficult passages in the poems.

There is an index of titles and first lines, and another of names, subjects, and words. The latter will be of considerable use to students. A note might have been included here on the gardening term "knot" (p. 30).

As is fitting in a reprint of *The Phoenix Nest* the proofs have been read as carefully as those of "R.S." himself. On p. 156 *transofrmed*, and on p. 153 *Parthenope* have been passed; also on p. 164 for 72.15 read 75.15.

H. J. BYROM.

**Shakespeare's Economics.** By HENRY W. FARNAM. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1931. Pp. xv+188. 11s. 6d. net.

THIS volume, from the pen of an Emeritus Professor of Economics at Yale, will interest Shakesperians more than economists. Of Shakespeare's own opinions of economic theories we know, and can know, very little. But all that the various characters in his plays say, in reference to agricultural customs, sea trading, money, usury, utopian commonwealths, is here selected, gathered and arranged for the curious. That Shakespeare had a range of interests as wide as his vocabulary, and that his technical points are generally of a rather surprising accuracy—this we knew. But G. B. S. can still cite texts to prove that Shakespeare was a snob, and against him can still be quoted Gloucester's lines:

So distribution should undo excess,  
And each man have enough.

It might be a motto for a Fabian pamphlet.

What could be done in this field, Professor Farnam has done; he is quite well aware that it is not very much.

The book, as a book, is admirable in paper, print, binding, colouring, illustration. The reproductions of the old abacus and the then-new notation, from *Margarita Philosophica*, 1503, and the two pages of writing from a Book of Hands (Handwriting) are worthy to be called exquisite.

R. J.

**Shakespeare's Problem Comedies.** By WILLIAM W. LAWRENCE. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1931. Pp. xiv+259. 12s. 6d. net.

**Shakespeare's Tragic Heroes.** By LILY B. CAMPBELL. Cambridge University Press. 1930. Pp. xii+248. 16s. net.

**The Genesis of Shakespeare Idolatry.** By R. W. BABCOCK. University of North Carolina Press. 1931. Pp. xv+307. 13s. 6d.

In an incidental remark on *Hamlet*, Professor Lawrence summarises the method in which he examines what he calls the problem comedies: *All's Well*, *Measure for Measure* and *Troilus and Cressida*.

The fundamental conceptions of the old Continental tale, and its later development at the hands of Kyd, as a tragedy of Blood, combined with contemporary views of such subjects as revenge, madness, and melancholy, provide the surest avenues of approach to the elucidation of the vexed questions which generations of critics attempted to settle out of their own heads.

There is perhaps an over-confident note in this, since we do not know for certain that Kyd ever handled the Hamlet story or that we have any trace of his work if he did; but in the application of his method to the problem in hand Professor Lawrence is singularly successful, being not only learned historically, but a critic with genuine taste and judgment. He recognises that "any great work of art must transcend in some degree the influences which shaped it," and if there is something grudging in his "some" he shows no lack of tact in treating the comedies he elects to deal with.

Examining the much debated question of Helena's character and asking whether the pursuit of her husband is to be considered the trick of a despicable schemer or the device of a high-spirited wife, Professor Lawrence has no difficulty in showing by means of a number of well-chosen analogues that she comes of most respectable ancestry. Folk story proves that Helena has the voice of ancient tradition in all parts of the world entirely in her favour; for a wife placed in her circumstances to act as she did was not merely no disgrace but the highest virtue.

But what of her success it may be asked—can such a union be happy? "To argue thus," Professor Lawrence replies, "is to miss the whole point of the Faithful Wife theme, whether in mediæval

and Ren  
harsh the  
unsuited  
Story tha  
pertinent  
Petrarch  
utterly d  
the whol  
folly.

Folk  
an artist  
the con  
immode  
then sho

This is  
The  
much  
Helena  
conver  
serious

Cor  
cannot  
of the

and a

TH  
male  
matic

T  
miss

B  
vigor  
to th  
of d  
as O  
as S  
matt

and Renaissance analogues, or in Shakespeare. No matter how harsh the treatment of the woman by the man, no matter how unsuited they may seem to each other, it is a convention of the Virtue Story that they 'live happily ever after.' " Professor Lawrence very pertinently quotes the Griselda story that so charmed Boccaccio, Petrarch and Chaucer in spite of their knowing the husband to be so utterly despicable. If he were regarded as anything but a convention the whole story of his wife's heroism would be reduced to miserable folly.

Folk tales and common opinions, however, may be handled by an artist in a critical and ironical manner. But if this is a satire on the conventionally minded of Shakespeare's time who found no immodesty in what historians of folk themes call the bed-trick, why then should Lafeu call her

a wife

Whose beauty did astonish the survey  
Of richest eyes, whose words all ears took captive,  
Whose dear perfection hearts that scorn'd to serve  
Humbly call'd mistress.

This is neither the language of convention nor of irony.

The new wine of Shakespeare's creative power was often too much for the old forms he chose as its receptacles. The vivid Helena or passionate Isabella marrying the vicious Bertram or conventional Duke outrages the critic who takes Shakespeare too seriously at such junctures. As Professor Lawrence says :

Conclusions about the moral convictions and feelings of the dramatists cannot be drawn from such scenes : they are obviously partly the style of the romantic and unrealistic drama.

and again :

The same miraculous processes which lead to the forgiveness of erring male characters, and their conversion to the paths of rectitude, also automatically make them perfect husbands.

Those who find some reason in this line of argument should not miss his treatment of *Measure for Measure*. Here is his conclusion :

Beside men and women like these (Lucio and his friends), full of vigorous life, the Duke, with his shifts and tricks, which strain plausibility to the breaking point, seems a puppet manufactured to meet the exigencies of dramatic construction. He is more important but quite as artificial as Oliver or the usurping Duke in *As You Like It*, who are wicked as long as Shakespeare needs them so. . . . Perhaps we may sum the whole matter up by saying that Shakespeare drew the Duke as he did because he

needed him, and that he drew the main protagonists and the low-comedy people as he did because they interested him. Pompey and Mistress Overdone and the rest, in particular, serve an important purpose, in their very detachment from the artificial details of the plot; they serve to make us forget the improbabilities which Shakespeare imported into the play, improbabilities which revolve about the Duke and his schemings; and they throw over the whole an illusion of vivid and unforgettable reality.

Professor Lawrence is too generous in his appreciation of the results so far obtained by other workers in the so-called historical and comparative method. The modesty of his own claims, however, is only surpassed by the skill with which he presents them. He will have discovered by now that he has taken Dr. S. A. Tannenbaum's "gravest doubts" about the genuineness of the Revels Accounts for 1604 too seriously. He also seems to doubt the truth of the statement that *Troilus and Cressida* was originally placed after *Romeo and Juliet* in the folio, for he says:

Some critics believe that it was originally designed for a place after *Romeo and Juliet*, but that play ends with page 79, and the paging of our piece would, according to the two numbered leaves, have to begin with page 77.

But if he looks at the Folio he will see that p. 79 in *Romeo and Juliet* follows p. 76. This error is actually due to a confusion resulting from the removal of *Troilus*. This piece began on p. 78, as the two numbered leaves prove, following on p. 77, which contained the conclusion of *Romeo and Juliet*. The Prologue was not, of course, a part of the original setting.

Professor's Lawrence's judgment is equal to his learning, which is extensive and accurate, and he has written a very helpful book.

In Miss Campbell's *Shakespeare's Tragic Heroes* we have set forth various Elizabethan views on such matters as revenge, madness, melancholy, jealousy. These she would use to interpret the actions of Shakespeare's four leading tragic characters. Her information is often very interesting and instructive, and she makes good points as when she shows that

in the language of Shakespeare's day it seems certain that Hamlet was not a man of natural melancholy humour.

It was melancholy "adust," a very different form of humour, that gave its colour to his actions. But this knowledge may help to remove an unnecessary assumption without taking us far towards a proper understanding of the character. And Miss Campbell

tends to reduce the inspiration of Shakespeare to the level of the commonplaces of contemporary moralists :

those who balance passion by reason are not Fortune's puppets. And such is the lesson of tragedy.

Mr. Babcock's work is a very useful survey of articles and essays on Shakespeare written during the eighteenth century. He pays particular attention to the period 1766-1799 with a view to discovering how far the work of the great Romantic critics is indebted to this generation. Any student wishing to know what was written during the eighteenth century about Hamlet, or the Unities, or the fitness of the plays for the stage will find here the references he requires.

PETER ALEXANDER.

**The Wizard, a Play by Simon Baylie.** Edited—for the first time—from the Durham and London Manuscripts, with Introduction and Notes, by Henry de Vocht. (Materials for the study of the Old English Drama, Vol. 4.) Louvain : Librairie Universitaire, Uystpruyt, publisher. 1930. Pp. cviii+204.

THE untimely end which was brought by the war to Professor Bang's series of "Materialien zur Kunde des älteren Englischen Dramas" was greatly deplored by the numerous students in this country and elsewhere who honoured its founder for his energetic and single-minded devotion to the newer ideals of English scholarship ; and the gallant attempt of his successor in the chair of English Philology at Louvain, Professor Henry de Vocht, to revive the series has every claim to the sympathy and support of scholars and scholastic institutions throughout the world. The difficulties in the way of the revival have been very great. On the one hand, many of the original subscribers were no longer in a position to purchase volumes the cost of which was necessarily considerably more than in pre-war times, and on the other, the destruction by fire of almost the whole of the unsold stock of the earlier volumes, and the consequent impossibility of completing sets, stood in the way of obtaining new subscriptions. Professor de Vocht has, however, persevered and has managed to bring out four volumes, a reprint of five of Ford's plays, two parts of Mr. Crawford's invaluable Marlowe Concordance and lastly this first edition of *The Wizard*.

It cannot be said that Simon Baylie, whoever he was—for

absolutely nothing seems to be known about him beyond his name—was a great writer, or that *The Wizard* is a great play, but it is well that all MS. plays dating from the Shakespearian period should be made accessible in print, and it may at least be said that this is not worse than some others. The fact that such widely separated dates as “before 1603” and “before 1640” have been assigned to it—the present editor places it between 1614 and 1625—is alone a sufficient reason for our wanting to know more about it.

The play exists in two MSS., one in the Durham Cathedral Library and one at the British Museum, and the relation of these presents a problem of considerable interest. From a very full and careful comparison of the two the editor deduces that the Durham MS. was transcribed from an older and better copy than that at the British Museum, perhaps, indeed, from the author's original. Apart from the absence of such extensive revision as generally marks an original draft, the Durham MS. has a peculiarity which seems to prove it to be a copy and one of a somewhat unusual type, namely that at the foot of several pages the writing is unduly spaced out, while on others part of the space is left blank though the sense goes on correctly to the following page. From this, and from certain other indications, the editor concludes that it was copied page for page from a MS. the pages of which were unequal in content; and further, that this copying was not done in the order of the pages of the MS. copied. The probability is, I think, that it was transcribed on loose sheets intended to be bound up later. A convenient way of producing a copy is, of course, first to put together the blank paper to be used into suitable gatherings, number the leaves consecutively and then, having separated them again, to copy page 1 of the original on page 1 of the blank paper and (supposing the intended gathering to consist of six leaves) the original page 12 on page 12 of the blank; then, turning the sheet over, to copy pages 2 and 11 and so on; for it is much easier to write on flat sheets than on sheets gathered into quires. Correction in the original text would easily account for variation in the amount of matter which the pages contained.

The London MS. cannot be a copy of that at Durham, but may be from a later and corrected form of the original or a copy of this. While in general it corresponds closely to Durham and embodies certain corrections made in this, it has itself been gone over and corrected in a number of places. This MS. has a peculiarity of its

own in  
capital,  
verse, s  
from a  
hand.

As  
with a v  
provide  
there s  
is of t  
duction  
paralle  
that in  
notes a  
wide r  
he has  
his in  
that a  
what  
This,  
whole  
editor

Der

THE  
differ  
meri  
Herr  
large  
writ  
has  
take  
the  
Sou

own in that it is written in very short lines each beginning with a capital, so that prose passages have at first sight the appearance of verse, suggesting that it was transcribed by an unintelligent copyist from a MS. on unusually narrow paper or in an unusually large hand.

As to the play itself little need be said. It is a play of intrigue with a wearisomely complicated plot which even the careful summary provided by the editor hardly suffices to render easy to follow; there seems little attempt at character-drawing, while the humour is of the crudest kind. In his very careful and elaborate introduction Professor de Vocht has noticed a large number of literary parallels to almost all the main incidents of the play, while admitting that in many cases the resemblances may be accidental. In the notes also, which, like the introduction, testify to an extraordinarily wide reading in both dramatic and non-dramatic work of the period, he has adduced many parallels for phrases employed, which, with his index, will afford useful material for students, though I think that at times he is a little too ready to scent allusion or imitation in what is no more than the common stock of writers of the time. This, however, is but a trifling fault, if it be one, and the work as a whole is a notable addition to the series and one of which both the editor and the University of Louvain may well be proud.

R. B. McK.

**Der Nachruhm Herricks und Wallers.** Von NETTY ROECKERATH. (Kölner Anglistische Arbeiten, 13 Bd.) Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz; London: Williams and Norgate. 1931. Pp. 116. Mk. 9.

THE objects of this investigation are twofold, the first to show the different views taken in England in the course of time as to the poetical merits of the two poets, the result being that Waller's star declined as Herrick's rose; the second to show that poetical reputation depends largely on non-æsthetic considerations, a thesis maintained by the writer's teacher, Professor Schöffler. With the first Dr. Roeckerath has been more successful than with the second. The different views taken by critics of Herrick and his works, after their rediscovery in the early nineteenth century, make extremely curious reading. Southey's inability to see Herrick's grace and charm is especially

surprising. The other object rather encumbers the dissertation and is hardly attained. Waller's contemporaries, with their ears trained to the minutiae of couplet verse and lyrical verse as they knew it, were better judges than we of the new smoothness and melody that he had introduced. The fact that in the Romantic Revival critics were not impressed by his merits is surely due in the main to their looking for quite other things in poetry. At present there is greater understanding of the earlier point of view. It is needless, therefore, to ascribe Waller's long-lived reputation to the part he had played in politics and in society.

As to Herrick, it is futile to express surprise at the coldness of the eighteenth century to his merits when his poems only existed in one edition and can only have been seen by very few eyes. One may still be surprised, however, at the slowness of the nineteenth century in giving him his proper place. Here, no doubt, the coarseness of his epigrams played a part. But the chapter devoted to the social position of Waller's and Herrick's critics is wasted work. The naïve remark "Über den Historiker W. Burnet (1734) konnte ich nichts näheres feststellen" raises a smile. Poor Bishop Burnet! His name was, however, not William, but Gilbert.

The article in the *Edinburgh* 1837 (p. 63) was Macaulay's. It is remarked (p. 94) that Moorman speaks of Herrick's epigrams in the same tone as the writer in the *Cambridge History of Literature*, vii, p. 14. But that writer was Moorman too.

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

**The Works of John Milton.** Columbia University edition under general editorship of F. A. PATTERSON. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1931. 18 vols. £32. Vols. I-IV in 7 tomes; Vol. I, Pt. I (Minor Poems), pp. xviii+330; Pt. II (*Samson Agonistes*), pp. vi+331-605; Vol. II, Pt. I (*Paradise Lost*, Bks. I-VIII), pp. xii+258; Pt. II (*Paradise Lost*, Bks. IX-XII), pp. vi+259-547; Vol. III, Pt. I (Anti-Prelatical Tracts), pp. xii+366; Pt. II (*Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*), pp. vi+367-385; Vol. IV (*Divorce Tracts, Of Education, Areopagitica*), pp. x+368.

THIS is the first complete edition of Milton's works; and deep gratitude is due for it to American scholarship and enterprise, and more particularly to Columbia University and Professor Frank

Allen Patterson and his numerous collaborators. The American enthusiasm for Milton has given birth to a whole library of Milton literature, some of it excellent, much of it of varying quality, as the *Review of English Studies* has duly pointed out from time to time. But the American national feeling for Milton—a widely different thing from the feeling entertained for Milton in England—commands deep respect, and has now achieved a fitting monument in this really colossal publication.

Various defects will no doubt be revealed by the prolonged use and persistent scrutiny of this work; but I have failed to discover any on a first contact with the volumes.

There are to be eighteen volumes. But many of the volumes are divided into two parts, and Vols. I to IV make already seven tomes. This has been wise, I believe, as, for instance, *Paradise Lost* with the notes would have made a tome of 500 pp. or so, a little too heavy and ungainly in this size of paper. The edition is a great pleasure to the eye and to the hand. The type is large and clear and beautiful, and the old spelling which in closely printed editions like Beeching's demands perhaps undue concentration of attention from the reader, is, on the wide page and in its leisurely spacing nothing but a pleasure. The binding has a sobriety of colour, design and lettering which is admirably fitted to the dignity of the poet.

The greatest treat to the eye and artistic emotions is probably the lovely reproduction in colours, as frontispiece, of Milton's portrait at the age of ten. It will of itself go far to make many readers realise more clearly that Milton was once a living human being and is not only a book. The reproduction of the miniature of Milton at twenty-two is also most welcome. There are other portraits and the title-pages.

The text is that of the last edition published in Milton's lifetime. A very reasonable decision, although it deprives us of the 1645 volume; but it gives us the sonnets as Milton finally arranged them, and not some of them in a kind of appendix, as Beeching was forced to place them. Since we have in Beeching the 1645 volume, it was better, in the complete edition, to do as the American editors have done, and give us the final publication. Professor Grierson's arrangement in the Florence Press edition, when he gave us all the poems in chronological order, regardless of the language or subject, was most interesting, and a very welcome experiment. But perhaps it was a little unfair to Milton and perhaps to the reader; I for one

found it a little bewildering—which perhaps also added to the pleasure given by that very lovely edition. Yet here also the American editors have followed the way of wisdom, and the principle of giving as standard text what was last published in Milton's life (whenever possible, of course) seems to me unassailable.

Very full textual notes give all the variations found in the editions published in Milton's lifetime. We are thus in possession of all the important textual facts. All the works not in English are accompanied on the opposite page by an English translation. This also was wise; the translations seem to have been most competently done, and compare very favourably, for instance, with the last translation of the Latin poems by Walter Mackeller, although that was already very good indeed.

It is of course in the publication of the complete prose works in a carefully edited text that the American editors are rendering us the greatest service. In many cases, the truly abominable Bohn edition of the prose and of the careless translations were our only resource; now we shall at last read Milton's prose not only in safety, but in pleasure. Lack of knowledge of Milton's prose is perhaps the most serious gap in the culture of most English cultured people; and the fault was not the public's. Many misconceptions about Milton will be removed by the mere fact of the publication of the prose, and, let me add, by the publication of good translations of the Latin books. Much pleasure and much fruitful meditation will be brought within reach of the ordinary cultured reader. We take it for granted, of course, that along with the *De Doctrina Christiana*, the translation of Sumner will be given, as presumably no one would dare to attempt to better that admirable piece of work; Sumner's notes ought also to be given, and in fact the whole of Sumner's work on the *De Doctrina* ought to be treated as part of the Milton canon, as without it much of Milton's thought is hard to understand.

I am sorry that the sound practice of adopting the last text available has prevented the editors from giving us the first edition of *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*. No doubt the second is better in every way; but in this case I think an exception should have been made. This would have added some fifty pages only to Vol. III or IV, and it would have been worth while to have the first outpouring of Milton's wrath and wisdom as it came out in 1643: and this first edition has never been reprinted. Perhaps

we may yet have it in with the volume of "doubtful" pieces which is announced; or perhaps Professor Patterson will make amends by giving us a facsimile of that celebrated pamphlet in his admirable collection of facsimile texts. There is a spearlike quality in the unbroken 48 pages of the first text, where no divisions into chapters and no headings appear; and the mere looking at it is worth much.

However, we must be grateful for what has been given us and this time America has done herself much credit.

DENIS SAURAT.

**Philosophical Poems of Henry More, comprising Psychozoia and Minor Poems.** Edited with an Introduction and Notes by GEOFFREY BULLOUGH, M.A. Manchester University Press. 1931. Pp. xc+250. 25s. net.

A FEW months ago, in *The Conway Letters*, Professor Marjorie H. Nicolson published a hundred and fifty letters of Henry More, collected by herself from various sources. The book very charmingly set More before us in the society of his friends, but it was not its purpose to publish his philosophical works, in prose or in verse. One was left a little uncertain as to his title to permanent remembrance. Now, thanks to Mr. Bullough, we are provided with an admirable edition of some of More's chief poems, and we know the man more completely than before.

The edition makes no claim to be exhaustive. It restricts itself to the long poem, *Psychozoia*, and some lyrics. And when one finds what poetry may become in a work which is a Christianization of the *Enneads of Plotinus*, and the trouble it causes to the conscientious interpreter, one can understand how both for his own sake and that of his readers, Mr. Bullough was content to give only an analysis of More's other long poems, *Psychathanasia*, *Antipsychopannychia* and *Antimonopsychia*. Mr. Bullough justifies this proceeding on rather different grounds: "I believe that I supply all of More's verse that is worthy of resuscitation"; "My aim is to present only those poems which I consider valuable for the student of seventeenth-century literature." The Introduction, which traces More's history, and shows how after an early revolt against the doctrine of Predestination he was led under the influence of Whichcote to Plotinus and Marsilius Ficinus, is an admirable piece of work. It includes an analysis of *Psychozoia*, which is further illustrated in the notes

on particular passages. These often explain More's meaning by his words in other connexions, and show Mr. Bullough's wide acquaintance with his writings. But often both here and in the Introduction very happy and illuminating parallels are drawn with Spenser and Bunyan. Compare, especially, pp. lxiii, lxiv.

*Psychozoia* is in form a poem of three Cantos in the Spenserian stanza, and Spenser is More's poetical master. But unlike Spenser he put philosophy before poetry, he had no love for the picturesque, he "steadily rejected grace and wit," he turned from Spenser's "stately euphony." The result is that the earlier expository part of *Psychozoia* was found obscure and irritating, even by contemporary readers. What were they to make of lines like these?

There *Proteus* wonnes and fleet *Idothea*,  
Where the lowest step of that profunditie  
Is pight : Next that is *Psyche's* out-array ;  
It *Tanis* hight ; *Physis* is next degree ;

Even More himself was at times dissatisfied :

Then gin I rashly blame  
My rugged lines : This word is obsolete :  
That boldly coynd, a third too oft doth beat  
Mine humourous ears.

It is only rarely that one feels that a poet is indeed speaking, as in the lines (ii, 20) about the dead man :

To horses hoof that beats his grassie dore  
He answers not : The Moon in silency  
Doth passe by night, and all bedew him o're  
With her cold humid rayes : but he feels not Heavens power.<sup>1</sup>

Even here the jerky Alexandrine spoils the passage.

Fortunately, half-way through this Second Book the poem takes a new turn. We have done with Plotinian abstractions, we get a living character Mnemon (More himself), on his pilgrimage to Truth, and in his intercourse with the people he meets on his road we have passages of exquisitely delicate satire, and see the sectaries of the seventeenth century and More's attitude to each group probably more clearly than we have ever done before. There is Corvino, "most like methought to a Cathedral Dean," the conventional cleric who finds all truth in the Church ; Psittaco, the self-satisfied Pres-

<sup>1</sup> There is poetry again in ll. 376-78 of *Cupid's Conflict* (p. 121) :

The Thrush, or Lark that mounting high above  
Chants her shrill notes to heedlesse ears of corn  
Heavily hanging in the dewy Morn.

byterian who bases his doctrines on the Bible, but is as ready as Corvino to call in the law to enforce his views (both

confidently preach  
Unless there be a form which men must teach  
Of sound opinions (each meaning his own)  
Authority is lost, our trade is gone  
Our Tyrian wares [purple and fine linen] forsaken, we alas ! shall mone);

the young Pithecius, who drinks in Psittaco's words till his head is turned ; Pico the ritualist, who bows lower to the King than to the altar ; Graculo the logician, who thinks reason the infallible guide ; and Glaucis, daughter of Psittaco, who considers that " election " sets her above all laws and all morality. More sees in Glaucis the self-confident spirit of a youth, who will submit to no authority over him but his own conscience. He tells us that he had had that spirit himself :

Thus in my youth, said *Mnemon*, did I use  
With Reverend Ignorance to sport and toy,  
And sllily would obnoxious Age abuse ;  
For I was a crank wit, a brisk young boy :  
And more than life I lov'd my liberty.

And as a college-tutor he can still sympathize with

that sweet temper we may oft behold  
In virgin Youth as yet immaculate,  
And unto drudging Policy unsold<sup>1</sup> . . .  
Dear lads ! How do I love your harmlesse years  
And melt in heart while I the Morning-shine  
Do view of rising virtue which appears  
In your sweet faces, and mild modest eyne !

In this part of the poem More is revealed in his high aspiration, subtlety of intellect, gentle satire and humour, and we can well understand the attraction his society had for Lady Conway. Thanks again to Mr. Bullough for admitting us, too, into the company.

I might spend many more pages in discussing this book, but I have only space to call attention to a few points in which I venture to differ from the editor.

p. 12, l. 3, " simply true." I take " simply " to = " abstractedly."

p. 21, st. 31, ad f. " belate." Perhaps a reminiscence of *Macbeth* III, vi, 7.

p. 23, st. 36, l. 8, " empse." I think, *pace* the *O.D.* this must be a misprint for " empte " or " emptie," not a variant form.

p. 23, st. 37, l. 9, " King Cathollicall." Surely rather a reference to the King of Spain, than to the Pope.

<sup>1</sup> This is my emendation of " unfold."

p. 28, sts. 50, 51. I see no allusion to the "Integer vitæ" Ode. But cf. Psalm civ. v. 21: The young lions roar after their prey and seek their meat from God.

p. 28, st. 52, l. 6, "that Africk rock." Pomponius Mela, *Chorog.* i, 8, makes the allusion clear: "Inde ad Catabathmon, Cyrenaica provincia est; in eaque . . . sunt et rupes quædam austro sacra. hæc cum hominum manu attingitur ille inmodicus exurgit harenasque quasi maria agens sic sævit ut fluctibus."

p. 41, st. 26, l. 5, "Daemon, not from Sciency" i.e. it is not derived from \*δάω, δαῖναι (to teach, learn), but from δαίω (divide).

p. 105, st. 71, l. 8, "that ruling Right, The Good is uniform. . . ." Explained apparently as "that, so long as Right rules, etc." I think it is an accusative, "that prevailing Truth." On p. 121, l. 5, an absolute construction is put in brackets.

pp. 111, 112, ll. 79-90. Is there any reminiscence of *Comus* here?

p. 114, l. 157. Should "my" be "thy"?

p. 119. More seems not to be so much defending Independency from fear of the censor, as rubbing it in to Psittaco that Independency is the child of Presbyterianism, and at the same time pointing out that its faults are the faults of ungoverned youth.

p. 238. English versions of "Ἀπορία" and "Ἐυνορία" are given by Professor Nicolson, pp. 299, 300, in a letter of More's, probably of January 1670, addressed to Lady Conway. The first by More differs little from that given here, but its reading in l. 5, "O Father Jove" is much better than "O Father! I own," and evidently right. The version of 'Ἐυνορία is that sent him by his friend, Elys.

The following misprints should be corrected:

p. xii, l. 7 from bot. "there could be" omit "be"; p. xxx, l. 27, "quommodo" read "quodammodo" (original quodāmō); p. xxv, l. 2 from bot., "unnecessary"; lxxiii, l. 4, for "Henry" read "Richard"; l. 5, omit comma after "invent"; p. 61, st. 89, l. 1, "maybe beseeem" (so in the *Phil. Poems*), but, query, "may beseeem"; p. 87, st. 18, l. 6, "Back" read "Back'd" (as in *Ph. P.*); p. 126, l. 5, read "caliginis" (do.); p. 138, l. 7 from bot., read "jura" (do.); l. 5 from bot., "torpent" (do.); p. 139, l. 2 from bot., "implicitus" (do.); p. 150, l. 11, "canat" (do.); l. 13, "sacrum" (do.); p. 169, l. 1, is this short line right?; p. 170, l. 3, cursûs, query "cursûs"; p. 172, l. 6, "linqua" read "lingua"; p. 176, l. 9 from bot. for Δόγος read Λόγος; p. 177, l. 21, for "untion," "union"; p. 192, l. 6 from bot. for "os" read "as"; p. 224, l. 8 from bot., for εἰναι read εἶναι; p. 240, l. 7, for ΠΡΘΕ read ΠΡΟΕ; p. 246, ll. 20, 19 from bot., "the First God," query "the First Good."

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

**An Investigation into the Character of Jonathan Swift.**

By Dr. C. VAN DOORN. Amsterdam: N. V. Swets and Zeitlinger. 1931. Pp. 152.

THE purpose of this essay is a psychological inquiry into the character of Swift. In 1908 an article by Professor Heymans appeared in *Zeitschrift für angewandte Psychologie* sifting one hundred and ten celebrities of various nationalities into appropriate receptacles, marked "Nervous," "Sentimental," "Sanguine," "Choleric," etc., save for a small remnant which refused to pass through the sieve. In the following year Professors Heymans and Wiersma published the results of detailed inquiry into the characters of 2,523 persons, based upon answers received to lists of ninety questions. Dr. Van Doorn has been inspired by their work to present the same ninety questions to Swift himself, his friends, contemporaries, biographers, and commentators, and finally to assess his character in tabular form.

The endeavour excites misgivings. Are we condemned to watch the growth of an immense library of monographs inflicting these ninety questions on all "famous men and our fathers that begat us"? Is not the inner personality of a man, that which distinguishes him from his fellows, something which evades the most searching questionnaire? Furthermore, the only justification for an inquiry of this kind is that it should reveal something which has hitherto escaped attention. But Dr. Van Doorn's conclusions add nothing to our knowledge. His general summary informs us that Swift's interests were chiefly political and ecclesiastical, that he owed his rise to "tenacious passion" and "ebullient activity," that he possessed "profound knowledge of human nature," that he was proud, domineering, temperate, orderly, punctual, contemptuous of science and philosophy, a stranger to music and art, indifferent to games, imbued with "fierce indignation" at the depravity of human nature, and that he was temperamentally incapable of happiness. All this has been said before—or contradicted; and some of it calls for qualification. "Ebullient" is hardly the appropriate word; and his knowledge of human nature was not without its serious lapses. He was blind, for example, to faults of Bolingbroke and Harley; and they succeeded in keeping secrets from him.

Again, Dr. Van Doorn pays hardly any attention to the law of

evidence. Passages from the *Journal to Stella*, Swift's letters, or his writings, remarks by contemporaries, subsequent biographers, and critics are loosely tacked together, without, for the most part, any attempt at assessment of values. An ironical observation by Swift himself, a few lines of verse, a chance incident, a remark by Vanessa, an ill-considered statement by Thackeray appear indiscriminately. Now and again some criticism is offered, though not in general. But evidence should be carefully weighed, at each stage, before judgment is entered.

On the whole Dr. Van Doorn has gathered accurately the general facts of Swift's history. It is not true, however, that he "took an active part in Irish politics" from "the time he settled in Ireland" (p. 8). Some years of silence intervened. The account of Swift's Irish friends (p. 9) is a little misleading. It is not the case (p. 11) that Mrs. Pilkington knew Swift longer than any of his contemporary biographers. They met in 1729, and all friendship ceased in 1738. Deane Swift knew him longer. Delaney knew Swift from 1718 to the Dean's death. Monck Mason, rather than Forster (p. 14), was Swift's first biographer to discriminate between fact and fiction. On p. 112 Dr. Van Doorn says, "Swift was very fond of books and had a fine collection of them." For a person of his station Swift's library was not large. During the last thirty years of his life the number of his books remained almost stationary. Dr. Van Doorn's remarks on Swift's handwriting (p. 120) suggest that he is acquainted only with a facsimile of a part of the *Journal to Stella*.

Some awkwardnesses and lapses apart, the author writes English, if not flexibly, commendably well. A more careful reading of proofs would, however, have saved solecisms and some unnecessary confusions. On p. 9, in a paragraph stating the purpose of the *Drapier's Letters*, we are suddenly and without the least break introduced to the Partridge hoax—a leap backward in time of sixteen years. It looks as if a manuscript leaf had slipped from its position and been set up by the compositor in the wrong place. On p. 10 Dr. Van Doorn reverses the parts played by Lecky and Dr. Bernard as writers of introductions. On p. 5 the Duke of Ormond is described as "Lord Ormond"; and on pp. 6 and 7, writing of Stella and Vanessa, the forms "Hesther" and "Esther" are used quite indifferently.

The following slips may also be noted. On p. 3, l. 30, "every" should be "very"; on pp. 9 and 50 "Sir R. Acheson" should be "Sir Arthur," and he is so correctly named on p. 111; "Germaine"

(p. 10) is usually spelled "Germain"; on p. 29, l. 25, "Henny" should be "Henry"; on p. 30, l. 8, "easy" appears for "easily"; on p. 33, l. 9, "Hamed's" should be "Hamet's"; on p. 50, l. 12, "Pendarvis" should be "Pendarves"; on p. 118 two lines of verse are printed continuously as prose; and there are a few printer's errors.

HAROLD WILLIAMS.

**Johnson's Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland and Boswell's Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides with Samuel Johnson, LL.D.** Edited by R. W. CHAPMAN. London: Humphrey Milford. Pp. xx+475. 1930. 3s. 6d.

THIS is a reprint, for inclusion in the series "Oxford Editions of Standard Authors," of the edition published in 1924 and long since out of print. Dr. Chapman has corrected a number of textual errors and misprints; but he has not reprinted the Notes and Appendixes, as some of the information there given will require modification now that Boswell's journals, including the original Hebridean journal, have been recovered and will shortly be available in their entirety; he has, however, left the references to them for the benefit of the curious.

L. F. P.

**The Letters of Robert Burns.** Edited from the original manuscripts by J. DE LANCEY FERGUSON. Two volumes. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1931. 30s.

A CONVENIENT edition of Burns's Letters has long been a desideratum, and a thorough revision of the text was also required. Nothing of the kind had been done for nearly forty years, since Wallace published his revision of Robert Chambers in the Burns Centenary year, 1896. Compared with his predecessors, Wallace's work had great merits, both in respect of completeness and accuracy; but the volumes were bulky, inconvenient, and difficult to obtain. The appearance, therefore, of Mr. Ferguson's handsome edition is most welcome. His task has been no light one, though simplified, as he points out in his Introduction, by the fact that the greater part of the existing originals are now in public libraries or otherwise accessible. The known material has, of course, greatly increased

during the last half-century ; while even the Globe Burns contains but 332 letters, Mr. Ferguson prints no fewer than 710. In view of the high prices given for Burns MSS. in recent years—only a few weeks ago £1,360 was paid for a Clarinda letter—one is not surprised to learn that more than half of the known originals are in America, and that the largest collection, containing 117 letters, is that of the Morgan Library, New York. The Birthplace Museum at Alloway, with its 100 MSS., including 60 letters, comes only second. It is fitting, therefore, that there should come from an American scholar what must undoubtedly be the standard edition for a long while to come.

Burns's letters deserve more attention than they generally receive, both for their own merits and for the light they throw upon their author. For this neglect, perhaps, he is himself to blame. The letters to Clarinda are apt to catch the reader's eye, and not the warmest admirer of Burns can stand up for them ; the stilted, sham-pastoral flirtation with a married woman, separated (though that was no fault of hers) from her husband, does not show the poet as a man of sense. The lady comes out of it much better. Though obviously flattered by a famous man's admiration, she generally keeps her head, and indeed behaves all through with almost as much propriety as Werther's Lotte. Of the other letters, a great many are marred by coarseness. Even Mr. Ferguson, with all his scrupulous insistence on the author's full text, is obliged to leave gaps here and there. No doubt, in this matter we have to make allowance for changed fashions in speaking and writing. Burns's letters are probably not so bad as Sir Robert Walpole's conversation, and it is among the penalties of genius that what the writer himself would probably rather not have seen in print may be treasured and reproduced for posterity.

But, when full allowance is made for all this, a study of the letters will reveal to many people a quite new Burns. For one thing, they shatter the "unlettered peasant" legend. As Mr. Ferguson says with perfect truth, they are clearly the work of "a highly though unsystematically educated man." The reading shown in them is pretty wide. The whole Burns family were known among their neighbours for this habit ; parents and children are described as often seen at meals with a book in one hand, and the porridge-spoon in the other ! But in the poet's case it is not only a matter of reading, but of shrewd comment and judgment on what he has

read. It is interesting, for example, to find when he is reading Virgil—of course, in Dryden's translation—how he prefers the Georgics. In the *Æneid*, not having enough historical background of his own to appreciate the epic of Rome, he is merely impatient at the obvious imitation of Homer, and also at the monotonous bloodshed of the battle-scenes. The style of the letters, except when Sylvander is posturing to Clarinda, is usually sound, strong English. This in itself is worth noting, for in Burns's verse the vast superiority of the dialect portions to those in "book-English" has long been a commonplace of criticism. In *Tam o' Shanter*, where the two are combined, Henley justly contrasts the diabolical movement and force of such lines as—

They reel'd, they set, they cross'd, they cleekit,  
Till ilka carlin swat and reekit,  
And coost her duddies to the wark,  
And linket at it in her sark !

with the pedestrian moralising and the almost Hudibrastic effect of

But pleasures are like poppies spread.

The test, in fact, can as a rule be applied all through the poetry, when one wishes to distinguish the first-rate from the second- or third-rate Burns. But the letters are another matter. On every page appears that blunt explosive force, the gift of hitting the nail straight on the head and saying what one wants to say in the plainest and strongest words. Burns possesses, in short, the gift of putting his powerful self into what he writes. Some of the letters are famous, such as the long autobiographical one of August 1787 to Dr. John Moore, the author of *Zeluco* ; or that to Captain Francis Grose (August 1790), containing, along with other witch-stories, the original tale of *Tam o' Shanter*. But on any subject that interests him Burns has always something to say, and says it with his own *vis vivida*. Whether it be a mere line or two, commending a poor neighbour-woman to a doctor ; or a note telling his friend Nicol of the loss of a worn-out mare (" My dear Sir, That d—mned mare of yours is dead. I would freely have given her price to have saved her ") ; or the heart-rending S.O.S., a few days before his death, to his father-in-law (" For Heaven's sake, send Mrs. Armour here immediately. My wife is hourly expecting to be put to bed. Good God, what a situation for her to be in, poor girl, without a friend ! "), the native force is always there. There is no question that, at his best, Burns ought to be ranked among the great letter-writers. If

he has neither the charm of Charles Lamb, nor the quiet winsomeness of Cowper, nor the peculiar appeal, nearer to our own time, of his fellow-countryman Stevenson, he is a far bigger man than any of the three.

Every lover of Burns is deeply indebted to Mr. Ferguson for these admirable volumes. Many letters are here printed for the first time, and no labour has been spared in tracing and verifying the original texts, wherever discoverable, on both sides of the Atlantic. The notes and glossary are adequate, without being excessive, and the Introduction is a wise and balanced statement, such as could hardly be improved upon. A useful feature is a kind of brief *Who's Who* of Burns's correspondents, giving a good deal of information not easily accessible, and clearing up a number of points hitherto obscure. Mr. Ferguson is certainly right in altering the Christian name of "Ellison" Begbie to Alison. He does not, however, refer to the conjecture mentioned by Leslie Stephen that this somewhat shadowy Alison was the original of Mary Morrison. As a last point, many readers will be grateful to him for the justice he does to the memory of the poet's wife—her courage, womanliness and good sense. It was Christopher North, long ago, who said with truth—"Of all the women Burns ever loved, Mary Campbell not excepted, the dearest by far, from first to last, was Jean Armour." Mr. Ferguson is no less emphatic: "Jean is the real heroine of Burns's life."

DUNCAN C. MACGREGOR.

### The Shelley Note-Book in the Harvard College Library.

Reproduced with Notes and a Postscript by GEORGE EDWARD WOODBERRY. Cambridge, Mass.: John Barnard Associates; London: Humphrey Milford. 1929. Pp. ii+134. 35s. net.

STUDENTS of Shelley are familiar at second- or third-hand with the Harvard Note-Book, described in 1889 by Mr. Woodberry in his *Notes on the MS. Volume of Shelley's Poems in the Library of Harvard College*, which were discreetly used by Mr. Thomas Hutchinson in preparing his Oxford text. No lover of Shelley can forget his thrill of delight, settling into the quiet content of satisfied judgment, on reading in the Oxford text "Swiftly walk o'er the Western Wave," the Harvard MS. version of the line first published posthumously by Mrs. Shelley with the vulgarly obvious reading (that set the metre

wrong from the start)—“Swiftly walk *over* the Western Wave.” It is good to see “Swiftly walk o’er the Western Wave” in Shelley’s own handwriting on p. 69 of the facsimile. Mr. Woodberry, it must be confessed, attributes the transcript of this poem to Mrs. Shelley; and since many of his attributions are wrong, it will be convenient to set down categorically those poems which were written in this Note-Book by Shelley himself :

P. 145, To the Lord Chancellor (in process of composition); p. 61, A Vision of the Sea; p. 69, To Night; p. 71, An Anacreontic; p. 81, Song; p. 84, A Dream; p. 100, To A Skylark; p. 109, Hymn to Mercury; p. 149, England; p. 150, Song; p. 151, Sonnet; p. 152, Sonnet; p. 153, A Ballad.

Mr. Woodberry sets down four of these as “in Mrs. Shelley’s hand,” and one as “in a different hand”; and he attributes to Shelley six others which were copied in by Mrs. Shelley. The two handwritings are alike, but the *d*’s, *r*’s and *g*’s differ, and no one who has devoted a couple of hours to the scrutiny of these pages, or the Shelley Manuscripts in the Bodleian, will feel any doubt or difficulty in distinguishing the hands.

The present book gives a facsimile reproduction, technically rather disappointing, of the whole Note-Book used by Shelley in 1819 and 1820 for copying in (sometimes with assistance from Mrs. Shelley), and in two cases actually for composing, poems. It contains one composition which has rightly never been included in Shelley’s poetical works—“A Ballad,” the last in the book, a poorly written, melodramatic tale of a starving woman, with her babe at her breast, begging bread from the “Religious Man,” Parson Richards, who had betrayed her. If the wretched verses were not in Shelley’s authentic hand and in process of composition, it would be, I think, impossible to believe that he wrote them. Mr. Woodberry unfortunately describes the poem as in Mrs. Shelley’s hand with corrections by Shelley.

The value of the book is that it reveals a little, here and there, of the process of poetic creation. Mr. Woodberry does not record in his notes the cancelled readings: this should always be undertaken as a sacred and imperative duty by editors of manuscripts, since the best facsimile often fails to make clear a deleted word, which in nine cases out of ten will be legible in the manuscript. First thoughts are often the key to second thoughts. In *To a Skylark*, pp. 100–105, the following variants are of interest :

l. 21, for "Keen as are the arrows," Shelley first wrote "Thy notes, like the arrows."

l. 33, for "From rainbow clouds there flow not," he first wrote "From the rainbow flow not."

l. 45, for "With music sweet as love, which overflows her bower," he first wrote "With music which is love and . . ."

l. 53, for By warm winds deflowered,  
Till the scent it gives

Makes faint with too much sweet those heavy-winged thieves  
he first wrote

By the winds deflowered . . .

Makes sick with too much sweet the heavy-winged . . .

The stanzas must be read in their place in the rhythmical structure of the poem to appreciate the metrical quickening or retarding which Shelley, with these touches, so deftly adjusts.

I notice one reading adopted by Mr. Hutchinson in the Oxford text, for which he quotes the Harvard MS. erroneously :

*To William Shelley,*

l. 12, With its life intense and mild.

The facsimile (p. 92) reads clearly

Within its life . . .

as does Mrs. Shelley in *Posthumous Works*, 1824.

HELEN DARBISHIRE.

**Swinburne: A Nineteenth-Century Hellene.** By WILLIAM R. RUTLAND. Oxford: Blackwell. 1931. Pp. viii+410. One guinea net.

THE author purports to judge Swinburne from a new angle, by placing him side by side with the Greek classics and the later poets who tried to revive the Hellenic spirit in their works. Comparison with the Greek tragedies on the one hand and with the classical tragedies of Racine, Milton, Goethe, Shelley, Arnold, on the other, should, to Mr. Rutland's mind, result in a recognition of the genuineness of Swinburne's Hellenic inspiration.

From a general point of view there is little to be said in favour of such a method; one may even doubt whether the name of method is at all suitable to an arbitrary grouping of works which, notwithstanding the common link of Greek inspiration, are disparate. But

the habit of indiscriminate comparison is such a time-hallowed one (Diderot found it easy to compare Lillo with Sophocles!), that Mr. Rutland should not be taken to task too severely for indulging his taste in that direction.

The general impression conveyed by Mr. Rutland's study is not that of an essay in *Kulturgeschichte* extended to a well-defined group of related works (as, for instance, F. Desonay's *Rêve hellénique chez les poètes parnassiens*, Paris, Champion, 1928), but of a bundle of scattered criticisms. What, for instance, Mr. Rutland has to say on Goethe's *Iphigeneia* may be of interest to the critic of Goethe, but does not advance by a single step the discussion on Swinburne's Hellenism. Moreover, the reader, who may reasonably expect the parallels with other classical dramas to end with the long Introduction, is rather taken aback by the recurrence of more parallels (with Landor, Keats, Chénier) in the Conclusion. He may suspect that the author has drawn up a list of whatever later poetry claimed to be inspired by Greece, and gone through it, item after item, in a rather mechanical fashion. (By the way, Seneca's influence is not to be dated from Corneille downwards, as we read on p. 35, footnote, but at least from Giraldis Cinthio.) In the section relating to Swinburne's classical dramas, the same lack of method is noticeable; it was open to the critic to study them from a philological point of view, as I did in a study which Mr. Rutland quotes by hearsay (*Le tragedie "greche" di A. C. Swinburne*, in *Atene e Roma*, summer issue for 1922, pp. 157-189), but he does not aim at a study of sources, apart from the avowed ones concerning the plots. On the other hand, supposing his aim to have been purely æsthetical, he should not have confined himself to repeating, either directly or indirectly, other people's appreciations. In any case, a detailed study of Swinburne's attitude to the Hellenic world, of the origin of this attitude, the circumstances in which it developed, the tendencies of the age, both at home and abroad, to which it was akin, seemed to be required by the very title of the book. Mr. Rutland has been content with adopting the scheme suggested by the chronological succession of Swinburne's works; he has a chapter on *Atalanta*, another on *Erechtheus*, and a third one on the "Hellenistic Poems," where he surveys one by one all the poems inspired by a Greek theme: the result is neither a philological nor a properly æsthetical commentary, but a collection of vague estimates and impressions which, readable and stimulating as they are, frequently offer a merely incidental

interest. What we read (pp. 269 ff.) on *Poems and Ballads, First Series*, may bear witness to Mr. Rutland's sound moral judgment as well as to his literary taste, but fails to teach us anything in connection with the central theme of the essay. Of the lines

Thou art noble and nude and antique. . . .

he writes: "Such lines . . . enjoy almost as much notoriety as they lack trace of meaning." These lines may appear ridiculous to a general reader, but they mean something very definite if seen against the proper background of French literature with which Swinburne was familiar. Mr. Rutland quotes elsewhere *Mademoiselle de Maupin*, but apparently he has been unable to envisage that novel from a historical point of view, or else he would have found there the explanation of those seemingly absurd lines. Another instance of defective critical insight can be gathered from pp. 309-10, where Mr. Rutland dismisses, after a short quotation, a poem like *The Last Oracle*, whose theme is characteristic of nineteenth-century neopaganism (cf. Leconte de Lisle's *Hypatie* in *Poèmes Antiques*, etc.).

Mr. Rutland is an enthusiast of Greek literature, and makes a point of quoting the Greek texts in the original. Unfortunately he has left his foreign quotations so full of misprints as to render their reading very painful. Greek accents and breathings are very clumsily handled: errors like *εὐρῶν* (p. 76), *πνοάι*, *όια* (p. 84), *παθήσκη* (p. 118), and even *τὸ κάλον* (p. 298) are of common occurrence. French quotations fare even worse: *excellent* (p. 26), *la destiné* (p. 28), *meutre* (for *meurtre*) consistently (pp. 29, 33, 137), *scene* (p. 30), *théatre* (p. 31), *ma faiblesse mortel* (p. 32), *asymetrie* (p. 121), *nécessaire*, *unjuste* (p. 138), *religion*, *religieuse* (p. 134), *helléniste* (p. 217), *hellénisté* (p. 237), and the passage on p. 239 (*sa pièce paraît peu humain, lutte intérieur*, etc.), and many other similar errors give indication of an imperfect knowledge of French not only on the part of the proof-corrector. German quotations are more correct, but here again we find *dass Gottliche* (p. 40), *Menscheit* (p. 42).

Mr. Rutland's deficient scholarship is shown also in his bibliography, where a quotation like this: "Kassner (?), *Die Mystik, die Künstler und das Leben*, 1909," could have been easily given in a less tentative form (Rudolf Kassner's book was published in 1900, and reissued in 1920 by the Insel Verlag, Leipzig, with the new title of *Englische Dichter*); while the footnote (p. 401) on B. Herlet's *Versuch eines Kommentars zu Swinburne's Atalanta*: "This item

was mentioned to me by an American correspondent, but having lost his letter I cannot vouch for its accuracy. I have not seen the book"—sounds rather startling after the praise bestowed on Herr Herlet on p. 236: "But many scholarly, serious and excellent critics share the opinion of Bruno Herlet . . . [follows a quotation from *Versuch eines Kommentars*]. . . . Dr. Herlet is a scholar, etc." I may add here that Dr. Herlet's commentary is far from deserving such extravagant praise; it does not rank above the usual quality of the kind of literature to which it belongs (*Programm des K. Alten Gymnasiums in Bamberg für das Schuljahr 1908/9*), although, so far as the commentary goes, it gives more information than a spare English commentary to *Atalanta* which recently appeared in a series destined to the secondary schools.

MARIO PRAZ.

**The Physical Basis of Rime.** An Essay on the Æsthetics of Sound. By HENRY LANZ. Stanford University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1931. Pp. xiv+365. 31s. 6d. net.

As rhyme is an acoustic phenomenon, Mr. Lanz begins by examining the musical composition of vowel tones and finds that each vowel has a characteristic tone, or, rather, range of tones similar to those of a musical note which contains a number of overtones. As in music, so in vowel sounds it is possible to construct a melody by causing them to move from one tone to another and back again to the original tone. An accented vowel sound at the end of a verse line is particularly marked, hence the use of rhyme builds up melody. "Rime is related to melody in so far as the satisfaction derived from it is based upon the return to the original tone, a satisfaction which is apparently well perceived even though psychologically it is given to us through the medium of words." Consonants and unaccented vowels are less important and need not be identical. "Rime may be defined as the unity of key in the melody of vowels as perceived through the tone quality of the whole ending."

Chapter IV is concerned with the origin of rhyme, but Mr. Lanz does not attempt to define whence rhyme came into English. Developing from assonance, it became particularly prominent in the fourteenth century, but existed much earlier. It grew from internal rhyme to end rhyme which became standard, as the last

accented vowel in the line is the most easily retained by the ear. Mr. Lanz points out a parallel between the rise of rhyme and that of music, and makes the suggestion that a definite relationship between the two might be established, but contents himself by remarking, "For us it is important to point out that the origin of rime is directly connected with the rise of our modern musical system. It corroborates our fundamental thesis that the same harmonic relation of tones lies at the basis of both rime and harmony."

In discussing the history of the theories of rhyme (Chapter V) Mr. Lanz comes to the conclusion that it is not rhythm that makes rhyme possible, but that rhyme aids rhythm. The accented vowels at the ends of lines in rhyming verse are important not because of the rhythm, or their identity with one another, but because they determine the melody, and the importance thus given them enables them to assist rhythm.

All this constitutes, and grows out of, Mr. Lanz's main thesis that rhyme is melodic and pleases because it satisfies our sense of melody. The statements and proofs are well laid out and carefully followed step by step, and their manner of presentation is interesting. When, however, we come to Chapter VI ("Rime and Rhythm") the material is more controversial, and Mr. Lanz sometimes makes statements without proofs, and gives proofs which are not always convincing. For instance, he says that "Any repetition of identical, or even similar, sensory elements is rhythm." To me, this is doubtful. A repetition of identical single sounds at equal periods of time (*e.g.* A A A A, etc.) would not of itself suggest any rhythm; such suggestion would be possible only if the sounds or the intervals between them were different in some way so that the repetition would be one of groups (*e.g.* A B A B, etc.).

In speaking of a passage from Pope, Mr. Lanz writes, "if it were not for the trochees, a large number of lines would be metrically correct, *i.e.* would retain all the five accents in the right places." This use of "correct" and "right" is unfortunate. Any poem is "metrically correct" as the poet wrote it; its metre is individual and peculiar to itself, and differences from strict regularity (which exists in theory) cannot be called "interruptions" and "distortions" of the rhythm. "Rime restores the rhythm distorted by interruptions," writes Mr. Lanz, but the "interruptions," so far from "distorting" the rhythm, are part of it; without them that particular rhythm would not be suggested. Moreover, if "Rime restores the

rhythm distorted by interruptions," what remedy is to be found for the "distortions" in blank verse?

In Chapter VII, Mr. Lanz makes an interesting excursion into psychology and æsthetics which is followed by comments on "The controversy concerning the value of rime" (Chapter VIII). He objects to the use of rhyme in dramatic plays on the ground, among other things, that "Rime, being a special form of music, would produce throughout the play an independent set of æsthetic emotions, which in the long run would act soothingly, 'musically,' causing in the mind of the audience a certain vaguely pleasant mood, which, though not consciously perceived, would nevertheless unconsciously modify other emotions essential to the play." The validity of this objection is questionable, for, if it be true, it would seem to be equally applicable to the pleasurable effect of metre.

There are two Appendices on technical matters, a Bibliography and an Index, and, in addition to the interesting manner of presentation already commented upon, it is evident that great care has been exercised in conducting experiments and collecting data from them.

N. R. TEMPEST.

**Dramatic Theory and the Rhymed Heroic Play.** By CECIL V.

DEANE, Ph.D., formerly Scholar of Emmanuel College, Cambridge. London: Humphrey Milford. 1931. Pp. vi+235. 10s. 6d. net.

THE variety and complexity of the influences which were responsible for the serious drama of the early Restoration period form an intriguing subject for scholarly endeavour at the present day. This volume by Dr. Deane is a still further effort to ascertain and evaluate the forces at work in the unique product of Restoration genius, the rhymed heroic play. The specific purpose of his study is "to determine how far the heroic play observed the neo-classic 'Rules' of the drama as expounded by the French Theorists and as somewhat freely adapted by English critics," but that investigation leads him in the opening chapter to discuss the origins of the heroic play.

Dr. Deane's review of the factors, other than critical theory, which helped to model the heroic play, relies almost entirely upon previous research in that field, although his emphases are somewhat individual. He considers the heroic play "to be yet another ramification of the attempts of the literatures of many countries after the Renaissance

to reproduce the classical epic in modern guise." It was infected by varying phases of "Platonic" influence; the early heroic play by the *roman héroïque*, the fully-developed form by the French heroic poem. The effect of contemporary philosophical thought on the content of the heroic play is more apparent than real. The numerous superficial resemblances in its ideas to those of Cartesianism arise, Dr. Deane concludes after an unduly lengthy resumé, from the diffusion of Descartes' principles through the consciousness of the age, whence they were injected as a matter of course into the drama. The legacy of the earlier English drama to the Restoration heroic species he does not stress too strongly. "It is doubtful whether the Beaumont and Fletcher romantic tragi-comedy influenced the heroic play as much as is sometimes maintained." An unmixed Elizabethan ancestry is to be attributed only to the elements of violent action, supernatural incident, comic vein, and complexity of plot, which features are inherent only in the native English theatre. (This inclusion of the comic vein seems needless when not a single example of an indubitable heroic play admixed with comedy is cited during Dr. Deane's discussion.) Above all these factors, however, in importance, according to Dr. Deane, stands the contemporary French drama. His hasty and perfunctory survey of the latter's influence ends with the assertion that "the drama of Corneille was almost the most potent force of all."

To the dramatic criticism of French theorists from 1630 to 1680, and of their English contemporaries, Dryden in particular, Dr. Deane devotes the major portion of his work. His methodical and drab accumulation of critical dicta is classified under the heads of tragi-comedy, the unities, violent action, bombast, and rime vs. blank verse. In his various considerations of Dryden's critical effusions previous to 1680, Dr. Deane betrays a strange inconsistency. At one point he states most aptly that Dryden would not let his admission of a primary desire to satisfy the caprices of his audience "deter him from composing prefaces of a brilliant speciousness arguing the legitimacy of this or that licence with which he had sought to popularise his play." Yet he proceeds to take Dryden's remarks usually at their face value and to discuss them as the carefully-reasoned views of a sincere and scholarly mind, when by implication he has already recognised that the critical intent of the ambitious and clever poet-laureate in his earlier years did not by any means correspond to that of such French critics as the Abbé d'Aubignac or Saint

Evrémond, whose statements Dr. Deane often juxtaposes with Dryden's.

After four chapters of examination into what he calls the neo-classic criteria of the time, Dr. Deane allows himself only one short chapter to analyse how greatly these criteria affected the form and content of the heroic play. (This proportioning of space would seem quite the reverse of the relative significance of the topics handled.) From the evidence of seven plays selected for analysis, *i.e.* *The Siege of Rhodes*, *Henry the Fifth*, *Mustapha*, *The Indian Queen*, *The Rival Ladies*, *Tyrannick Love*, *Sophonisba*, he finds the neo-classic rules exercised a wholesome restraint for the most part on the heroic plays and influenced dramatic practice in three rather indeterminate stages. In its earliest stage, the heroic play largely adhered to the strict standards of the French theorists; in the second, it took on its own freedom within limits; in the third, marked by the return of blank verse and the exploration of new themes, neo-classic orthodoxy was extensively readopted.

In his final paragraphs Dr. Deane suggests a line of thought concerning the heroic play that he should have developed at length. It is possessed of greater novelty and significance than his rather obvious conclusions regarding the "Laws of Good Sense" and their effect on English Restoration drama. The heroic play, he says, is the product of the two chief contending forces in the Restoration Age; incoming neo-classicism and the English temper of independence in dramatic forms. It displays "a kind of logical audacity, which may be best termed the baroque spirit," wherein an "exuberant vigour accepts but strives against an established art-form, almost breaking its bounds in the process of expressing itself within them." The aim of baroque architecture is to "astonish the beholder with its vainglorious magnificence in much the same way as do the heroic plays of the bombastic type." The inherent weakness of both these efforts in æsthetic expression is "an over-reliance on the element of surprise; so that, when the novelty of its first triumph had worn off the heroic play tended to deteriorate into a thing of spectacle, and similarly baroque architecture degenerated into the Churrigueresque or rococo."

If Dr. Deane's volume as a whole had shown the perspicuity of his few concluding remarks, his study of a most interesting subject to dramatic students might be greeted with enthusiasm. As it is, the generally pedantic style and the stiff disconnected structure,

caused doubtless by the revamping of a Ph.D. thesis, render the book most disappointing reading, while too much compilation from second-hand material, leading occasionally to such traditional errors as that the first Orrery play was not performed until after *The Indian Queen*, reduces to a considerable degree its value for scholarly reference.

WILLIAM S. CLARK.

**The State of Shakespeare Study.** By J. M. ROBERTSON. Routledge. 1931. Pp. x+198. 6s. net.

"To tests must we come," Mr. Robertson reminds us in his new volume; and, indeed, his insistence on the application of scientifically devised tests to the problems of the Shakespeare canon is as rigorous as ever, his exposure of slipshod and evasive criticism (or that he considers slipshod or evasive) as shrewd and as close-wrought. It is for him, as ever, "a matter of deep concern to apply all the technical tests which can enlighten us," and to seek "a consistent detection of hands, first through versification, next through diction, vocabulary, imagery and phraseology." In the light of this demand he passes in review the recent contributions to the discussion of the canon, surveying the work done in the immediate past by Professors Lascelles Abercrombie, A. W. Pollard and Dover Wilson, by Sir E. K. Chambers, Mr. John Bailey, and others.

Here is the usual agility, shrewdness and close in-fighting. Mr. Robertson calls forth our admiration by the ease with which he moves among data so numerous and so complex in their relations as almost to demand for their expression the formulæ of the organic chemist; the disputations of the medieval universities would perhaps have offered an ampler arena for his battle than do modern conditions. It is unfortunate that this shrewdness is sometimes blunted by what appears to be prejudice in Mr. Robertson's views on certain aspects of University studies and of æsthetics. Surely, for example, the account of how poets come to be poets cannot suitably be sought from undergraduates, whatever training they are receiving; not even, perhaps, from those who are attempting to give the training; but only from a quite other and, so far, more reticent Authority. . . . It may be permitted to suggest also that though the bibliographical knowledge of a scholar-poet might be challenged in case of doubt, it is less within the province of most of us to question his æsthetics.

There is a natural distinction between the men who know a craft and the men who only know about it, and, with the best will in the world, the majority of us—scholars and critics, but not poets—serve out our term in the second and inferior class.

But when all is said, and in spite of the fact that his handling of his adversaries sometimes makes us invoke the memory of a Marquess of Queensberry, we cannot but respect the strenuousness of Mr. Robertson's argument and the vigour of his hope that scholars "will yet master the open secret of the differentia between Shakespeare's versification and that of all his corrivals, first by thoroughly reading and re-reading the latter all over the field, and then by analysing the Shakespearian technique from start to finish."

[Misprints *Marlone*, p. 25 : *mouveau*, p. 109.]

U. M. ELLIS-FERMOR.

**The Place-Names of Walthamstow.** (Walthamstow Antiquarian Society Official Publication No. 24.) By P. H. REANEY. 1930. Pp. 55. 7s. 6d. net.

*Walthamstow Place-Names*, by P. H. Reaney, M.A., is an excellent example of the thoroughness with which the place-names of a single parish can be dealt with when it is possible to give sufficient time and space to the task. The opening pages comprise an Introduction in which the history of the various manors within the parish, as well as that of their mediæval holders, is carefully traced out. This part of the book should prove of interest to students of the early manorial history of the county.

The remainder of the book deals with the actual place-names of the parish, including those of farms, houses, streets, and fields. Each name is discussed in detail with its early spellings and is illustrated by comparative material from elsewhere in the county and from other counties. Mr. Reaney suggests two alternative etymologies for "Walthamstow": "the welcome place" (O.E. *stow*) or "the place of *Wilcume*," this being a feminine personal name in O.E. The numerous examples which he gives of place-names in *stow* elsewhere in England show that in nearly every case the first element of the name in question is either a descriptive element or the name of a saint, so that he is probably right in giving preference to the former interpretation.

Some interesting names in the parish are "Gallons" for earlier

*Callowlands*; "the Naze" for earlier *The Neye* (M.E. *atte neye*, "at the low-lying ground"); "Hagger Farm," 1332 *atte Hangre* (O.E. *hangra*); and "Billery Key," evidently identical in origin with "Billericay," the etymology of which has not yet been solved. Mr. Reaney is probably right in suggesting O.E. *ampre*, "sorrel" as the first element of "Aubrey Lane" (formerly *Ambrelond*), and this explanation is very likely correct also for other English place-names containing this element, some of which have been otherwise interpreted.

For "Mitchley Marsh" (p. 23) the forms given are no doubt corrupt, since the place-name appears as *Mochilley*, *Mochillefeld* in a Tottenham court roll of 1502, and is clearly from O.E. *micel* and *leah*. For "Bristol" (p. 10) the author might have added the O.E. spelling *Brysgstowe* from the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle s.a. 1052. The "Sale" (p. 34) may be O.E. *sealh*, "willow," but it may be noted that "sale" is common in the Rockingham Forest area in wood names, possibly with some quite different meaning.

Mr. Reaney gives a good deal of illustrative material not only from Essex but also from other English counties, and his forthcoming volume on Essex place-names for the English Place-Name Society will be a welcome addition to English studies.

J. E. GOVER.

**Britannien und Bibeltext.** Der Vulgatatext der Evangelien in seinem Verhältnis zur irisch angelsächsischen Kultur des Frühmittelalters. Von HANS GLUNZ. Kölner Anglistische Arbeiten. 12 Band. Leipzig: Tauchnitz. 1930. Pp. 187. Mk. 16.

THIS book is a sequel to the same author's *Die lateinische Vorlage der westsächsischen Evangelienversion*. Its aim is to show how the forms of the Vulgate texts which were current in the Irish and Anglo-Saxon monasteries at the beginning of the Middle Ages arose and extended their influence. In the first chapter Dr. Glunz discusses in an extremely interesting way the causes which led to the rise of regional texts of the Scriptures in Greek and Latin, and the rest of the book traces the operation of these causes in the region under discussion. The importance of these insular versions (to borrow a term from palaeography) is not confined to the British Isles, for the missionary activity of the Irish and their English successors

carried their forms of the text all over the Continent, a process vividly illustrated by the maps in which the influence of the different texts is here shown. It is impossible to discuss here the details by which the author establishes the interplay of the various forms of the text, the Old Latin, the Italian, the Irish, the English, and others, but a study of his results will give the reader a clearer idea of the vigorous Latin culture which is the essential background to the vernacular literature of the time. The most recent work on manuscripts has made it more and more evident that the intellectual history of those times can be best understood by concentration on the main centres of culture, and this is as true for the early vernacular literatures as for that Latin civilisation which has a more obvious origin in the great monastic houses. So that such a work as this has a definite use for those whose interest it is to trace the rise of the infant literatures in the languages of modern Europe, and is not out of place in a series like the *Kölner Anglistische Arbeiten*, which is primarily concerned with the language and literature of England.

ROBIN FLOWER.

**Modern Research with Special Reference to Early Irish Ecclesiastical History.** Lectures delivered at University College, Dublin, April 1929. By DOM LOUIS GOUGAUD, O.S.B. Dublin: Hodges Figgis. 1929. Pp. 60.

IN these lectures, delivered by the historian of Celtic Christianity in a university dedicated from its inception to Celtic studies, the development of Irish ecclesiastical history is traced from its first beginnings in the monasteries through medieval times to the great revival in the seventeenth century under Colgan and his fellows, and the work of Ussher and Ware and the recovery after the penal times through the activities of the native scholars, O'Curry and O'Donovan, and their Protestant fellows from Reeves to Plummer. And the discourse ends in a consideration of the possibilities of the future. This is not a proper place to consider the details of Dom Gougaud's argument. But it will not be invidious to call attention to the complaint of a Benedictine scholar that since Colgan's day the most signal work in this field has been left to Protestant students. This is not entirely due to any remissness on the part of the Catholic seminaries. Some of the blame must be borne by conceptions of education prevalent in Ireland and not only in Ireland. The study

of the medieval vernaculars has gradually won its way into university courses. But the vernacular of the learned—the Latin literature of medieval Europe—has no chair dedicated to it in any of the universities of these Islands. The students of medieval history, of medieval theology, of medieval literature, of medieval art—all these must make their own way into this vast, and for England largely uncharted, region, lacking the specialist help without which they cannot properly pursue their studies. Something more is needed here than the representation of medieval history and theology for which some provision is made here and there. We may hope that Dom Gougaud's lectures will help to call attention to the sore need of Ireland. But the lesson is not for Ireland alone.

ROBIN FLOWER.

**The Germanic Case of Comparison with a Special Study of English.** By G. W. SMALL. (Language Monographs published by the Linguistic Society of America. Edited by G. M. BOLLING. Number IV.) 1929. Pp. 121.

DR. G. W. SMALL's first volume on this subject dealt with the Semantics and Syntax of the Comparative Particle; this one presents the Germanic Case of Comparison; by this title one is to understand that the volume contains a study of the use of inflexions to express the Degrees of Comparison. We are promised a third volume—on the *Mode of the Clause of Comparison*—which will, it is hoped, complete the study of this whole phenomenon. The author himself gives us the clue to the value of such studies as these in the words: "Syntax, the finer and more subtle aspect of grammar, representing as it does our very process of thinking"; the value is indeed here: in that a study in Syntax may, and should, bring out the finer and more subtle meanings of words—for language is the very process of our thinking.

We are told that "the main purpose of the present study was to establish the very existence of the case-construction of Comparison as a frequent and idiomatic expression." Not only has this purpose been successfully achieved, but this treatise "has brought out for the first time the actual strength of the case-construction in O.E.," and has shown "that the O.E. dative of Comparison is definitely in the tradition of a native Germanic case-construction, which developed quite normally out of a Pre-Germanic ablative of Comparison."

This monograph concentrates almost exclusively on those case-inflexions expressing comparison which occur in O.E. It has been done so thoroughly that the importance of its bearing on the same problem in the other Germanic languages will be obvious to all. No teacher or student of Old English can afford to neglect this careful and orderly piece of work.

Further, Dr. Small has demonstrated the disappearance from English of the case-ending which expresses comparison. He has discovered the limitations in the use of the inflexional construction which existed in English during a period of time covered by the records that we have. That these limitations existed in times of which we have not written records, and in all the Germanic languages, is a matter of doubt, and the existence of them still remains to be proved. On the other hand, there is considerable certainty that the inflexional construction of comparison "only partially covered the field of expression embraced by the comparison of inequality in all Indo-European languages and especially in Germanic."

In another direction, too, more work is necessary. The field for further research is suggested by the author in the words: "Sufficient evidence has been brought forward . . . to indicate that there was in Germanic a trace of another case of Comparison beside the dative." The significance of this for students of Comparative Philology should not be under-estimated.

The scope of this work may be indicated by a partial summary of its contents. The Introduction opens with a "Theory of Comparison" and with an explanation of the Particle and Case-Inflexion as rivals in the expression of comparison. Chapter I presents a simple survey of the case-inflexion in Gothic, Scandinavian, O.H.G., O.S., and O.F. Chapter II contains a brief review of the problem in O.E. Chapter III examines the evidence in O.E. poetry, and Chapter IV in O.E. prose. Chapter V examines the possibility of a Genitive case-ending to express comparison and of an Instrumental of Comparison.

In so good a work it is regrettable that there are a few statements which are not expressed as lucidly as they might be. And there are a few which are questionable. For instance, "The only active process of Comparison that can possibly be presented to the mind is that between two objects or two groups." Putting aside the obvious criticism that the process of Comparison is a mental process and cannot possibly be *presented* to the mind, one might argue that the

mind can deal instantaneously with a pattern, say, of three or five lines or shapes, arranged in increasing size; for it perceives the pattern as a whole—and the relation of comparison is part of that perceptive act. That the mind *must* deal with one or two objects at a time when comparing three or more things would certainly be objected to by the upholders of the Gestalt Psychology.

Again, we know that mental responses, if recurring continually, become more and more schematised, especially if the response is closely bound up with a common element in slightly differing stimuli—as it is with responses involving comparison; so that it is not possible to believe that cognitive processes involving comparison are so crudely mechanised as is suggested by the author in “we say that an object is *bitter, soft, high*, etc., only after having mentally placed it beside various other similar objects *one at a time*, and deciding that it is more or less intense in quality than each one in turn.” The writer apparently here allows an explanation of an initial process to stand as the explanation for habitual processes that have brought about an organisation of mental responses.

But such flaws as these do not detract from the value of the results of Dr. Small's research, for they occur chiefly in his general statements on language and thought. He invariably hits the nail on the head when he is dealing with particulars.

This monograph is sound of scholarship, scientific in arrangement and method, and discriminating in its understanding of the form and meanings of language. The author is to be congratulated on a most satisfactory piece of work.

P. GURREY.

**The Year's Work in English Studies.** Volume X. 1929.

Edited for the English Association by F. S. BOAS. Oxford University Press. London: Humphrey Milford. 1931. Pp. 418. 10s. 6d. net.

THE tenth volume of this invaluable publication appears without the name of Professor Herford, whose association with it began in 1921, when he contributed a chapter to the second volume, and who had been joint-editor since 1926; and the whole task of editing, which in spite of his practised band of contributors must be a heavy one, has fallen to Dr. Boas. It can be no easy matter to adjust the varying claims for space and to settle who is to deal

with the rather numerous works which from the range of their subject or the method of their treatment might fall almost equally well within two or even more of the thirteen chapters into which the book is divided, and there can be nothing but praise for the way in which the editor has carried out his task.

The only change in the contributors is that Professor Elton replaces Professor Herford in dealing with General Works of Literary History and Criticism, a choice which could not have been bettered.

It is interesting to compare this volume with the earlier ones of the series. The total output of scholarly work on our language and literature has evidently increased greatly since 1919-20, for the size of the tenth volume is more than double that of the first or second and almost double that of the third, without there being any apparent increase in the amount of space devoted to the separate items. But more important than this merely numerical increase is the evidence which such a comparison will give us of the way in which the more careful kind of scholarship, formerly almost restricted to texts earlier than about 1650, is now being applied to those of much later periods. We may note also the greater attention which is now paid to minor writers, with the result that those of more outstanding importance are seen in a truer and more intelligible relation to their times.

R. B. McK.

#### SHORT NOTICES

**Shakespeare's Hamlet. The First Quarto, 1603.** Reproduced in facsimile from the copy in the Henry E. Huntington Library. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts; (London: Humphrey Milford). 1931. Pp. xii+66. \$4.00; 17s. net.

This facsimile of the copy of the 1603 quarto of *Hamlet*, formerly in the possession of the Duke of Devonshire, has been produced in collotype at Vienna from photostats supplied by the Huntington Library. It is a good piece of work, but I cannot help wondering whether a clearer result might not have been produced from ordinary photographic negatives without the intervention of photostats. I have not indeed seen the Huntington copy of the quarto, but if it is as clean a print as that at the British Museum, better collotypes should surely have been obtainable of many of the pages than are given by this reproduction. The last page of the facsimile (taken from the B.M. copy, as the leaf is wanting in Hunt.), has been, by some misunderstanding, placed much too low. The headline should have ranged with the (absent) headline of the page opposite, the last line of the text, "Becomes . . . amisse." coming opposite to "*Hamlet*, before I die, here take my hand."

It is interesting to compare this facsimile with that made from the same original

by Griggs, under the supervision of Furnivall, in, I believe, 1880.<sup>1</sup> The latter was probably the best work possible at its date, but the new one is in every way superior. While the Griggs facsimile is, in general, correct and fairly clear, and the text, apart from the five errors<sup>2</sup> pointed out by Aldis Wright in the *Cambridge Shakespeare*, ix, p. xxxvi, shows few signs of tampering, it is somewhat remarkable that the headlines were faked almost throughout, and very carelessly. The original had many headlines partially cut away, but it spelt "*Tragedie*" on 1<sup>r</sup> and 3<sup>r</sup>, and "*Tragedy*" on 2<sup>r</sup> and 4<sup>r</sup> of each sheet. Griggs added a complete headline on every page (somewhat too high above the text), spelling "*Tragedie*" in all cases. Other errors noted in a hasty comparison are the omission of an "*exit*" on F1 and of part of the catchword on D1, while in the second line of I2<sup>r</sup> a clear "*sir*" is turned into "*sit*." For minute work the Griggs facsimile will be entirely superseded by the new one, but it will still have its use for reference on account of the line-numbers and references to the Globe text with which Furnivall provided it.

R. B. McK.

**Plutarch's *Quyeté of Mynde*, translated by Thomas Wyat.** Reproduced in facsimile from the copy in the Henry E. Huntington Library, with an Introduction by CHARLES READ BASKERVILL. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press; (London: Humphrey Milford). 1931. Pp. xvi+58. \$2.50; 10s. 6d. net.

This is a heliotype (? = collotype) facsimile of a supposed unique book formerly at Britwell Court and only known from a mention in the Bibliographical Society's *Handlist of Books printed by London Printers*, which does not give Wyatt's name. It cannot, I think, be said that it will add anything to Wyatt's reputation, though it perhaps adds something to our knowledge of his interests, for both as prose and as translation (from Budé's Latin version) it is clumsy and, as the editor admits in his interesting little introduction, "makes rather difficult reading." Nevertheless the book deserved to be reproduced in facsimile on account of its rarity, as an unknown work of Wyatt, and as the first of the rather numerous sixteenth-century translations from Plutarch's *Moralia*.

R. B. McK.

**Jerome K. Jerome. *Seine Persönlichkeit und literarische Bedeutung*.** By WALTER GUTKESS. Verlag der Frommanschen Buchhandlung (Jena). 1930. Pp. xii+118.

As Walter Guttess points out in his foreword, this book is in no sense a biography such as Alfred Moss has written, in his *Jerome K. Jerome: His Life and Works*, though he admits to having made use of this book in the latter part of his own work; it is rather "An æsthetic appreciation of his accomplishments, a realisation of his artistic development, a statement of his merits and a settling of his place in modern English literature." This task is attempted first by a probing into his character by means, mostly, of his travel books, and, secondly, by a survey of his works as a whole.

The survey is not, however, as comprehensive as one might be led to suppose from the list at the beginning. Most certainly everything is referred to in one way or another, but those works for which the author has a special preference may be

<sup>1</sup> It has sometimes been supposed that the Quarto Facsimiles were issued by the New Shakspere Society, and at the 136th meeting (in 1888) Furnivall apparently claimed the series as one of the Society's achievements. From the early prospectuses it seems, however, that the Society had abandoned its original scheme of reprinting the best quartos "in favour of its founder, Mr. Furnivall," who had undertaken to superintend the issue of a series of photo-lithographed facsimiles to be executed by Mr. W. Griggs.

<sup>2</sup> The most startling of these—the alteration of two speakers' names—are explained, as the present facsimile shows, by the lithographer having followed two modern pen-corrections!

allowed as much as six pages, while some other work, generally considered to have great merit, may be allotted only a few lines. For instance, *The Passing of the Third Floor Back* is referred to as a play "whose great success is ununderstandable to us to-day," while *Three Men on the Bummell* and *The Diary of a Pilgrimage*, being almost exclusively about Germany, are spoken of at great length. On the other hand, his choice of quotations is large and varied, and shows great insight and understanding. It is really through them that the author has gained the most help in what he set out to prove, namely, that Jerome has written artistic and at the same time popular successes, and has thereby enriched English literature very considerably.

J. K.-F.

**Collected Essays, Papers, etc., of Robert Bridges, V: George Darley.** Oxford University Press: Humphrey Milford, London. 1930. Pp. xvi+173-201. 2s. 6d. net.

This part of Dr. Bridges' *Collected Essays*, left partly in revised proof at his death, has been seen through the press by Mrs. Bridges, who has completed the Preface and Note from her husband's rough draft. It contains two essays on Darley, which originally appeared (one only in part) in 1906 and 1908, and have been to some extent rewritten. There are not many new symbols introduced in this essay; indeed, only one is altogether new, a symbol to denote the vowel in "the" and "feel." Dr. Bridges calls this "the true romance I" and seems to regard the vowel of "the" as short and to feel it as "somewhat heavier than the short true English I of *hit*." The pronouncement seems a little confusing, for, at least in the cultivated pronunciations of the day, "the" has different sounds before a vowel and before a consonant ("the oak" and "the dog"), neither of which is, of course, the same as when we talk of "the article 'the.'" In the next essay "u" is to be treated, thus completing the vowels.

**The Huntington Library Bulletin.** Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. Number 1, May 1931. Pp. 214. 10s. 6d. net. Number 2, November 1931. Pp. 176. 20s. net.

This bulletin, which is to appear from time to time as material accumulates, is primarily intended to "particularize the resources of the Huntington Library and attempt to estimate their importance." It will include bibliographical and other information about collections and individual items in the Library, and texts of important MSS. and printed books, which are too brief for separate publication, and in view of the number of unique or very rare works which the Library contains it is evident that the Bulletin is likely to be of great importance and interest to students, and that it will be necessary for them to keep a watchful eye on its contents. It is unfortunate that the price should be somewhat high.

The full contents-list of the first two parts is given among Periodical Publications, but one or two items may be mentioned here. In Number 1 we have an interesting account of Henry E. Huntington and of the building-up of his Library, and an article on the more important collections which were purchased more or less *en bloc* for incorporation in it, such as the Kemble-Devonshire plays, purchased in 1914, and the Bridgewater House Library, purchased in 1917, as well as many American libraries, such as those of Elihu D. Church (1911) and Beverly Chew (1912), both very strong in Elizabethan and Jacobean poetry. In the second number there is a valuable check-list of English Newspapers to 1800 contained in the Library, and, perhaps most interesting of all, at any rate to the bibliographer, facsimiles of the outer formes of Sheet B of the Bridgewater and Kemble-Devonshire copies of the *First Part of the Contention*, 1600, the first of which is one of the very rare examples of Elizabethan proof-correction, the errors marked being duly corrected in the other copy. The facsimiles are accompanied by a note by Professor Tucker Brooke.

R. B. McK.

## VOLUMES OF COLLECTED ESSAYS

*In consequence of the large amount of space taken by reviews of miscellany volumes of this type it is proposed in future, as a general rule, merely to list the contents as is done in the case of periodical publications. The titles of the volumes will be included in the yearly index.*

**Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature**, Vol. XIII.  
Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1931. London: H. Milford. Pp. viii+332. 14s.

Further Sources of Ælfric's Saints' Lives (Grant Loomis), pp. 1-8.

Shrove Tuesday Football (F. P. Magoun, Jr.), pp. 9-46.

The Origin of the Proverb (B. J. Whiting), pp. 47-80.

The Story of Joseph and Potiphar's Wife in Mediæval Literature (F. E. Faverty), pp. 81-127.

The Pastourelle and French Folk Drama (W. P. Jones), pp. 129-163.

The Weeping Statue and Dante's *Gran Veglio* (H. T. Silverstein), pp. 165-184.

The Sowdon of Babylon and its Author (H. M. Smyser), pp. 185-218.

Four Paradoxes by Sir William Cornwallis, the Younger (R. E. Bennett), pp. 219-240.

Kyd's Pedringano: Sources and Parallels (F. T. Bowers), pp. 241-249.

English Literature in Russia (E. J. Simmons), pp. 251-307.

Lessing's Correspondence with Mendelssohn and Nicolai, August 31, 1756, to May 14, 1757 (F. O. Nolte), pp. 309-332.

**Essays and Studies in English and Comparative Literature**. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. 1932. Pp. x+231. \$2.50.

Diomedes: The Traditional Development of a Character (A. A. Hill), pp. 1-25.

Some Illustrations of the Mediæval *Gab* (J. R. Reinhard), pp. 27-57.

The *Paradossi* of Ortensio Landi (W. G. Rice), pp. 59-74.

On Some Peculiarities in Shakespearean Texts (H. T. Price), pp. 75-79.

The Italianate Background of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (O. J. Campbell), pp. 81-117.

Political Aspects of Dryden's *Amboyna* and *The Spanish Fryar* (L. I. Bredvold), pp. 119-132.

Swift's Conversion to the Tory Party (R. W. Babcock), pp. 133-149.

The Williams Transcription of *Hellas* (B. Weaver), pp. 151-168.

The Conception of Beauty in the Works of Shelley, Keats and Poe (S. F. Gingerich), pp. 169-194.

Chrétien de Troyes: A Bibliographical Essay (J. R. Reinhard), pp. 195-231.

## OTHER BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS RECEIVED

- The Relation of Gologros and Gawane to the old French Perceval.** P. J. KETRICK. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America. 1931. Pp. 132.
- Guide through the Romantic Movement.** Vol. I. E. Bernbaum. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons. 1931. Pp. 480.
- Jonathan Wild.** H. Fielding. (The World's Classics Series.) London: H. Milford. 1932. Pp. iv+289. 2s. net.
- Chaucer.** JOHN MASEFIELD. (Leslie Stephen Lecture, Cambridge, March 3, 1931). Cambridge University Press. 1931. Pp. iv+36. 2s.
- Die Ausdrücke für "Arbeit" und "Beruf" im Altenglischen.** A. SZOGS. Heidelberg: Carl Winter. 1931. Pp. xvi+143.
- Studien zu den Aktionsarten im Frühmittelenglischen.** Dr. H. W. HÄUSERMANN. Vienna: W. Braumüller. 1930. Pp. viii+86. R.M.5.
- Die Englischen Nasalverben.** Dr. J. RATH. Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz. 1931. Pp. 128. M.8.
- Sklaverei, Staatskirche und Freikirche.** Dr. A. LOTZ. Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz. 1929. Pp. 114.
- Zum Weltsprachenproblem in England im 17 Jahrhundert.** O. FUNKE. Heidelberg: Carl Winter. 1929. Pp. vi+163. M.10.
- Studien zur Geschichte der Sprachphilosophie.** O. FUNKE. Bern: A. FRANCKE. 1927. Pp. 140. Fr.4.80.
- Poetry and Dogma.** J. DRINKWATER. (Arthur Skemp Memorial Lecture, Bristol, January 29, 1931.) Bristol: J. W. Arrowsmith, Ltd. 1931. Pp. 34. 1s. 6d. net.
- The Creation of Character in Literature.** J. GALSWORTHY. (The Romanes Lecture, the Sheldonian Theatre, May 21, 1931.) Pp. 27. 2s. net.
- La Teoria Poetica del Newman.** F. OLIVERO. (Pubblicazioni della Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore. Serie Quarta. Vol. X. Scienze Filologiche.) Milano: Società Editrice "Vita e Pensiero." 1930. Pp. vi+51+10. L.4.
- Shakespeare Allusions and Parallels.** A. B. BLACK and R. M. SMITH. Bethlehem, Penn.: Lehigh University. 1931. Pp. viii+59. 50c.
- Die Politische Schulung des Englischen Volkes.** H. SCHÖFFLER. Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz. 1931. Pp. 38. M.1.25.

- Englische Wege zu Kant.** ELSE WENTSCHER. Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz. 1931. Pp. 86. M.3.
- Engländertum und Englische Sprache.** P. ARONSTEIN. Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz. 1931. Pp. 68. M.2.50.
- Arthurian Bibliography.** Vol. I (1922-1929). Ed. J. J. PARRY. New York: The Modern Language Association. 1931. Pp. iv+59. 75c.
- The Art of Geoffrey Chaucer.** J. LIVINGSTON LOWES. (Sir Israel Gollancz Memorial Lecture, British Academy, 1930.) London: H. Milford. 1931. Pp. 32. 2s. net.
- Associating with Shakespeare.** H. GRANVILLE-BARKER. (Shakespeare Association Lecture, November 25, 1931.) London: H. Milford. 1932. Pp. 31. 1s. net.
- Some Thoughts on *The Mayor of Casterbridge*.** W. H. GARDNER. (English Association Pamphlet 77.) London: H. Milford. 1930. Pp. 29. 2s. 6d. net.
- Christina Rossetti.** DOROTHY M. STUART. (English Association Pamphlet 78.) 1931. Pp. 18. 2s. net.
- The Novel and the Fairy Tale.** J. BUCHAN. (English Association Pamphlet 79.) London: H. Milford. 1931. Pp. 16. 2s. net.
- Chatterton.** W. MACNEILE DIXON. (Warton Lecture, British Academy, 1930.) London: H. Milford. Pp. 22. 1s. 6d. net.
- Virgil in English Poetry.** G. GORDON. (Warton Lecture, 1931.) London: H. Milford. Pp. 17. 1s. net.
- Matthew Arnold.** E. K. CHAMBERS. (Warton Lecture, 1932.) London: H. Milford. Pp. 25. 1s. net.
- Sir Henry Spelman and the "Concilia."** F. M. POWICKE. (Raleigh Lecture, British Academy, 1930.) London: H. Milford. 1931. Pp. 37. 2s. net.
- Sir Sidney Lee, 1859-1926.** C. H. FIRTH. London: H. Milford for the British Academy. 1931. Pp. 20. 1s. net.
- Sir Israel Gollancz, 1863-1930.** F. G. KENYON. London: H. Milford for the British Academy. 1932. Pp. 17. 1s. net.
- Robert Jephson (1736-1803).** M. S. PETERSON. Lincoln, U.S.A.: University of Nebraska. 1930. Pp. 45.
- Swinburne and Baudelaire.** H. NICOLSON. (The Zaharoff Lecture.) The Clarendon Press. 1930. Pp. 21.
- Robert Bridges.** Recollections by L. PEARSALL SMITH. His Work on the English Language by Elizabeth Daryush. (S.P.E. Tract, No. XXXV.) The Clarendon Press. 1931. Pp. ii+481-513. 2s. 6d. net.

## SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By H. WINIFRED HUSBANDS

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN, Vol. 66, March 1932—

*Beowulf*, 489 f. 600, 769 (R. Imelmann), pp. 321-45.

AE. \**scerwan* (W. Krogman), p. 346.

Some Inventions of the Pre-Romantic Period and their Influence upon Literature (Erika von Erhardt-Siebold), pp. 347-63.

The Camera Obscura, the Colour Organ, and the Aeolian Harp.

Dante Gabriel Rossetti and William Blake (B. J. Morse), pp. 364-72.

The Initial Stages in the Development of the English Problem-Play (M. Ellehaug), pp. 373-401.

Nachträge zur Kontamination bei Chaucer (F. Karpf), pp. 467-68.

Zu Shakespeares Sonetten (M. J. Wolff), pp. 468-69.

*Proof* (A. E. H. Swaen), pp. 469-70.

Addenda to the *Notes on the Anglo-Saxon Pioneers* (G. Langenfelt), p. 471.

ENGLISH STUDIES, Vol. XIV., April 1932—

The Absolute Genitive (W. van der Gaaf), pp. 49-65.

Some Aspects of Provincial Drama in the Eighteenth Century (F. T. Wood), pp. 65-74.

On the Perfect of Experience (R. W. Zandvoort), pp. 76-79.

On Lamb's Style (T. B. Stroup and A. G. van Kranendonk), pp. 79-82.

HERRIGS ARCHIV FÜR DAS STUDIUM DER NEUEREN SPRACHEN, Vol. 161 (New Series 61), March 1932—

Eine angelsächsische Ring-Inschrift (Hermann Harder), pp. 37-39.

Lydgatiana (Karl Brunner), pp. 40-43.

Unterdrückte Revolutionsverse des jungen R. Southey: "Muir und Palmer" (Hans Marcus), pp. 44-51.

Die Runen der ags. Schwertinschrift im Britischen Museum (Hermann Harder), pp. 86-87.

Zur Deutung von ags. *hiismeel* (Hermann Harder), pp. 87-88.

Christ our Pope (F. Holthausen), pp. 88-89.

Note on Middle English Hymn to Mary and Christ.

Zur neuenglischen Lautgeschichte (K. Luick), pp. 89-90.

## THE HUNTINGTON LIBRARY BULLETIN, Number 1, May 1931—

Announcement, p. 1-2.

Henry E. Huntington (Robert O. Schad), pp. 3-32.

Huntington Library Collections, pp. 33-106.

Incunabula Medica in the Huntington Library (Herman Ralph Mead), pp. 107-51.

New England (Frederick Jackson Turner), pp. 153-98.

A Document concerning Shakespeare's Garden, pp. 199-201.

Letter from Sir T. Temple to his steward [1631], referring to cuttings of vines to be obtained from "Mr. Hall, Phisicon" of Stratford-on-Avon.

Letter of George III to Thomas Townshend, pp. 202-04.

Two tracts on Marriage by Robert Copland (Beatrice White), pp. 205-07.

*The complaynte of them that ben to late maryed* and *A complaynt of them that be to soone maryed*. Both contain Copland's name in acrostic.

Treatise against Judicial Astrologie (Mary Isabel Fry), pp. 207-10.

MS. of J. Chamber's *Treatise* of 1601, an earlier draft.

Diego de Vargas, pp. 210-11.

Fielding's *Miser*, pp. 211-13.

A folio edition, n.d., which is here maintained to be earlier than the octavo of 1733.

The Tout Library, p. 214.

Notice of the acquisition of the historical library of the late Prof. T. F. Tout.

## — Number 2, November 1931.

Check List of English Newspapers and Periodicals before 1801 in the Huntington Library (Anthony J. Gabler), pp. 1-66.

Some Explorations in San Marino (Sir William Beveridge), pp. 67-85.

MSS. in the Library serving for the study of English prices, household accounts, etc.

Elizabethan Proof Corrections in a Copy of *The First Part of the Contention*, 1600 (Tucker Brooke), pp. 87-89.

With 8 pp. in collotype.

Four Scarce Poems of George Wither (J. Milton French), pp. 91-121.

Line for line reprints of *The Tired Petitioner* [1647], *Carmen-Ternarium Semi-Cynicum* [1648-1649], *A Timely Caution*, 1652, *Predictions of the Overthrowe of Popery*, 1660.

The Letters and Accounts of James Brydges, 1705-1713 (Edward Léon Harvey), pp. 123-47.

Coleridge Marginalia in Henry Brooke's *The Fool of Quality* (Edwin Berck Dike), pp. 149-63.

Three Rare Books about Women (Beatrice White), pp. 165-72.

*A Dyalogue defensyue for women*, 1542, *The Schole house of women*, 1561 (? for 1541). *The prayse of all women called Mulierum Pean* (c. 1542).*The Troubles of Queene Elizabeth* (Mary Isabel Fry), pp. 172-76.

Relation of the play to its sources.

# SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 377

## JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AND GERMANIC PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXI., April 1932—

Spenser's Muse (Josephine W. Bennett), pp. 200-19.

Clio, not Calliope.

Smollett's Early Years in London (L. M. Knapp), pp. 220-27.

Evidence of Rate-books.

Position of Adverbs (D. Thos. Ordeman), pp. 228-33.

Black Magic and Miracles in *Macbeth* (Mildred Tonge), pp. 234-46.

Some Characteristic Features of Aspect in English (G. O. Curme),

pp. 251-55.

A Further Note on Old English Tree Climbing: *Christ*, vv. 678-79

(B. J. Whiting), pp. 256-57.

## LIBRARY, Vol. XII., March 1932—

The Printing of John Dowland's *Second Booke of Songs or Ayres* (Margaret Dowling), pp. 365-80.

Gabriel Naudé and John Evelyn: with Some Notes on the Mazari-  
nades (The Earl of Crawford and Balcarres), pp. 382-408.

Notes on Single-sheet Incunabula (Stephen Gaselee), pp. 409-19.

The Marriage of Mary Queen of Scots to the Dauphin: a Scottish  
Printed Fragment (Douglas Hamer), pp. 420-28.

Fragments from Bindings at the Queen's College, Oxford (Strickland  
Gibson), pp. 429-33.

American Editions of the *Poems* of Burns before 1800 (Anna M.  
Painter), pp. 434-56.

## LONDON MERCURY, Vol. XXV., March 1932—

Exit Planché—Enter Gilbert (H. Granville-Barker), pp. 457-66.

Continued April, pp. 558-73.

— Vol. XXVI., May—

The Secentenary of William Langland (N. K. Coghill), pp. 40-51.

Grandmother to Black Beauty (May Nugent), pp. 52-60.

Mary Sewell and her works.

## MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. XLVII., March 1932—

A Tourneur Mystification (S. A. Tannenbaum), pp. 141-43.

Authorship of the "Character" of Robert Cecil.

Elizabethan Proof Corrections (Tucker Brooke), p. 144.

Correction of assumption in article in the *Huntington Library Bulletin*.

Some Sources of Richard Edwards's *Damon and Pithias* (C. M.  
Newlin), pp. 145-47.

Plutarch's *Life of Dion* and Laetius' *Lives of the Philosophers*.

The Date of the Second Edition of *The Constant Couple* (G. W.  
Whiting), pp. 147-48.

Chaucer's "Brutus Cassius" (H. T. Silverstein), pp. 148-50.

The same error in ninth-century commentary on Virgil.

A Note on the *Nonne Preestes Tale* (S. Sakanishi), pp. 150-51.  
On l. 4174.

Omissions from *Swift en France* (C. M. Webster), pp. 152-53.  
Why Milton uses "Cambuscan" and "Camball" (F. W. Emerson),  
pp. 153-54.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. XLVII., April—

Lost Stage Directions in Orrery's Plays (W. S. Clarke), pp. 240-43.  
Wycherley, Montaigne, Tertullian, and Mr. Summers (H. M. Jones),  
pp. 244-45.

Note on quotation in the dedication of *The Plain Dealer*.

*Hudibras* and Swift (C. M. Webster), pp. 245-46.

Was John Dryden Collector of Customs? (C. E. Ward), pp. 246-49.

The *N.E.D.*: Additions and Corrections (E. B. Dike), pp. 249-54.

The English Vogue of Prologues and Epilogues (A. N. Wiley),  
pp. 255-57.

Chaucer's Sermon and Retractions (J. A. Work), pp. 257-59.

Relation to the *Canterbury Tales*.

Chaucer's "Turkish Bows" (C. M. Webster), p. 260.

Note on *Romaunt of the Rose*, l. 930.

— May—

Notes on Browning's *Pauline* (W. L. Phelps), pp. 292-99.

MS. notes by John Stuart Mill and Browning in Forster's copy.

Coleridge's *Theory of Life* (Alice D. Snyder), pp. 299-301.

Additional MS. notes.

On the Revisions of *Hyperion* (Adele B. Ballman), pp. 302-03.

The Authenticity of Burns' *When First I saw Fair Jeannie's Face*  
(Esther C. Averill), pp. 303-05.

Printed in the *Analectic Magazine*, September 1813.

An Interpretation of Blake's *A Divine Image* (S. A. Larrabee),  
pp. 305-08.

Additions to the Bibliography of W. S. Gilbert's Contributions to  
Magazines (A. E. Du Bois), pp. 308-14.

Whitman on Arnold: an Uncollected Comment (J. H. Birss),  
pp. 316-17.

Addison's *Letter from Italy* (P. B. Anderson), p. 318.

Variant versions.

The Theory of a Plurality of Worlds as a Factor in Milton's Attitude  
toward the Copernican Hypothesis (Grant McColley), pp. 319-25.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XXVII., April 1932—

The Case for Nicholas Grimald as Editor of *Tottell's Miscellany*  
(H. J. Byrom), pp. 125-43.

# SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 379

"A Man of Religion" (Doris V. Ives), pp. 144-48.

Chaucer's "poure persoun" and the Lollards.

Southey's Relations with Finland and Scandinavia (H. G. Wright), pp. 149-67.

Sophie von La Roche's Visit to England in 1786 (J. G. Robertson), pp. 196-203.

Notes on the Word "Gar-secg" (Wm. J. Redbond), pp. 204-06.  
Suggested Celtic origin.

A Biographical Note on John Dryden (Charles E. Ward), pp. 206-10.  
Dryden's income as Poet-Laureate.

"Mr. Kristrom" in Boswell's *Life of Dr. Johnson* (Harald Elovson), pp. 210-12.

Biographical note on Pehr Chriström.

MODERN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXIX., February 1932—

Chaucer at School (Edith Rickert), pp. 257-74.

Books in the library of St. Paul's School.

The Parallel of Deism and Classicism (Arthur O. Lovejoy), pp. 281-99.

Henry Baker, F.R.S. (1698-1774) (G. R. Potter), pp. 301-21.

Some Early Versions of William Shenstone's Letters (J. F. Fullington), pp. 323-24.

Randolph and Prynne (Cyrus L. Day), pp. 349-50.  
Alterations in *The Muses' Looking-Glass*.

The *Female Tatler* (R. T. Milford), pp. 350-51.  
Files of original and rival papers in the Bodleian.

NINETEENTH CENTURY, Vol. CXI., March 1932—

The Conversion of Edward Gibbon (Edward Hutton), pp. 362-75.

— May—

Walter Pater: a Revaluation (Bertram Newman), pp. 633-40.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 162, February 6, 1932—

Some Fresh Shakespearean Facts (J. C. Whitebrook), pp. 93-95.

Christopher Mountjoy and his family.

Violet Eyes and Shakespeare (V.R.), pp. 97-98.

Note on *A Winter's Tale*, iv. iii. 120. Reply by Wm. Jaggard, March 19, p. 213.

— February 13—

Edmund Spenser (W. H. Weply), pp. 110-14.

Recent researches into his life and lineage. Continued February 20, pp. 128-32: February 27, pp. 146-50: March 5, pp. 165-69: March 12, pp. 182-87: March 19, pp. 200-06: March 26, pp. 220-24: April 2, pp. 239-42: April 9, pp. 256-60. Further notes by G. H. W., March 5, pp. 175-76: by D. Hamer, H.I.A., and R. S. B., March 19, pp. 209-11: by F.R.S.M., R.S.B., and D. Hamer, March 26, pp. 230-31.

Printers and Authors in the Sixteenth Century: Some Sidelights  
(Beatrice White), pp. 114-16.

London Booksellers, 1700-1750 (Ambrose Heal), pp. 116-20.  
Addenda to previous notes.

*The Flapper* (R. T. Milford and E. H. Allen), p. 122.

Note by Walter Graham, April 2, p. 246.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 162, February 20—

On the Authorship of *Eikon Basilike* (G. W. Whiting), pp. 134-35).  
Supplementary bibliographical list.

———— March 12—

Milton's "Asclepiadean Verses" (C. W. Brodribb), p. 188.

Suggested alternative reading of defective line. Reply by T. O. Mabbott,  
April 9, pp. 263-64.

———— March 19—

Shakespeare and Archery (C. M. Webster), pp. 200-02.

———— March 26—

Robert Tutchein, a Bookseller of the Seventeenth Century (W.  
Jaggard), p. 224.

———— April 2—

Notes on Samuel and William Henry Ireland and the Shakespeare  
Fabrications (G. Hilder Libbis), pp. 236-39.

Continued April 16, pp. 273-76.

Notes on Chatterton: Letter to William Smith (T. O. Mabbott),  
pp. 242-43.

———— April 9—

The Father of Shakespeare's Son-in-law, Dr. John Hall (A. Ransford),  
p. 254.

———— April 23—

The Origin of the Soul in English Poetry before Wordsworth (G.  
Bullough), pp. 290-94.

Continued April 30, pp. 308-11.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. XI., April 1932—

The Authorship of Certain Articles in the *Quarterly Review* (Karl G.  
Pfeiffer), pp. 97-108.

John Wilkes, Humanist (George McCracken), pp. 109-34.

Sonnet Structure: an Analysis (E. H. C. Oliphant), pp. 135-48.

English Literature, 1660-1800: a Current Bibliography (R. S. Crane  
and M. E. Prior), pp. 167-215.

# SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 381

## PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, Vol. XLVII., March 1932—

On the Dating of the English and Scottish Ballads (Louise Pound),  
pp. 10-16.

The *Impresa* Portrait of Sir Philip Sidney in the National Portrait  
Gallery (Emma M. Denkinger), pp. 17-45.

Spenser's Garden of Adonis (Josephine W. Bennett) pp. 46-80.

The Plot of *The Faerie Queene* (Lawrence Blair) pp. 81-88.

The Psychology of Memory in Spenser's *Faerie Queene* (Daniel C.  
Boughner), pp. 89-96.

Classical Coinage in *The Faerie Queene* (John W. Draper), pp. 97-108.

Spenser and the Clerkship in Munster (Raymond Jenkins), pp. 109-21.

Spenser's Theory of Courtesy (Alexander C. Judson), pp. 122-36.

The Date and Purpose of Spenser's *Veue* (Wm. C. Martin), pp. 137-43.

Archaism and Innovation in Spenser's Poetic Diction (Bruce R.  
McElderry, Jr.), pp. 144-70.

Swift's *Tale of a Tub* Compared with Earlier Satires of the Puritans  
(Clarence M. Webster), pp. 171-78.

Daniel Defoe and the Quakers (Ezra K. Maxfield), 179-90.

Hazlitt as a Shakespearean Critic (Harry T. Baker), pp. 191-99.

*Mephistophiles in England; or, The Confessions of a Prime Minister*  
(Archie R. Bangs), pp. 200-19.

Evidence of Bulwer-Lytton's authorship.

Schopenhauer and Pessimism in Nineteenth Century English Litera-  
ture (Ralph H. Goodale), pp. 241-61.

Literature and Life Again (E. E. Stoll), pp. 283-302.

## REVUE ANGLO-AMÉRICAIN, Vol. IX., February 1932—

Thomas Edward Brown, le poète de l'île de Man (S. G. Simpson),  
pp. 191-99.

The Supernatural in Shakespearean Drama (F. T. Wood), pp. 200-17.  
Humour et amour (L. Cazamian), pp. 218-23.

### — April —

L'offrande d'un traducteur: Notes sur l'anglais de John Florio,  
traducteur de Montaigne, I (A. Koszul), pp. 287-304.

Thomas Paine's Relation to Voltaire and Rousseau, I (H. H. Clark),  
pp. 305-18.

*Othello* and Elizabethan Army Life (J. W. Draper), pp. 319-26.

## STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXIX., April 1932—

(Dedicated to Edwin Greenlaw, Editor, 1915-1925.)

Publications of Edwin Greenlaw, 1899-1932 (W. F. Thrall),  
pp. 135-40.

- Edwin Greenlaw and the Study of Literature (J. H. Hanford), pp. 141-48.
- Taverner's *Garden of Wisdom* and the *Apophthegmata* of Erasmus (Charles R. Baskervill), pp. 149-59.
- William Gager to Queen Elizabeth (Tucker Brooke), pp. 160-75.  
Poems from MS. collection in the British Museum.
- Henry Robarts: Patriotic Propagandist and Novelist (Louis B. Wright), pp. 176-99.
- Magnanimity in Spenser's Legend of Holiness (H. S. V. Jones), pp. 200-06.
- Spenser's *Four Hymnes*: a Resurvey (F. M. Padelford), pp. 207-32.
- Hermione's Statue (H. Carrington Lancaster), pp. 233-38.  
Suggested source.
- A. W. and *A Poetical Rhapsody* (Hyder E. Rollins), pp. 239-51.
- Recent Literature of the English Renaissance (Hardin Craig), pp. 252-365.

## TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, February 4, 1932—

- George Crabbe, February 3, 1832. pp. 65-66.
- Chaucer at St. Paul's School? (Edith Rickert), p. 76.
- Chatterton's Spelling of *Ælla* (E. H. W. Meyerstein), p. 76.
- Meres and the Death of Marlowe (Don Cameron Allen), p. 76.  
Meres' borrowings from Ravisius Textor's *Officina*.
- The Date of the *Champion* (Walter Graham), p. 76.  
Reference to number for April 3, 1744.
- A Jonson Crux (*Hibernicus*), p. 76.  
Note on *Every Man in his Humour*, iv, 6.

## February 11—

- A Cup of "Charneco" (S. George West), p. 95.  
Note on *II Henry VI*, II, iii, 62-63.
- Gray's *Thyrsis* (E. E. Kellett), p. 95.  
Likeness to a song of Götz.

## February 18—

- Blake's *Songs of Innocence* (J. H. Wicksteed), p. 112.  
Blake and Salzmann's *Elements of Morality*.
- Tom Brown and *The Tale of a Tub* (Clarence M. Webster), p. 112.  
Note by E. Knox Linton, February 25, p. 134.
- Dionysius Periegetes (John Lodge), p. 112.  
Quotation in the last *Rambler*.
- A Satyr on the Court Ladies* (Geoffrey Bullough), p. 112.  
Poem in manuscript in Edinburgh University Library.
- Paradise Lost*, I, 301 (W. F. P. Stockley), p. 112.

**TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, February 25—**

The First Baconian (Allardyce Nicoll), p. 128.

Dr. James Wilmot; MS. in Durning-Lawrence Library. Reply by Wm. Jaggard, March 3, p. 155: rejoinder by A. Nicoll, March 10, p. 172.

The Earliest Compositions of Sir Thomas Browne (Geoffrey Keynes), p. 134.

Latin oration, and verses in praise of Camden.

**— March 3—**

A Collection of Ballads (M. Segar), p. 154.

Collection published in 1723.

Ben Jonson on Chapman (Percy Simpson), p. 155.

MS. notes in copy of Chapman's *Homer*.

The Date of Wycherley's Birth (H. P. Vincent), p. 155.

May 28, 1641. Further notes by W. G. D. Fletcher, March 10, p. 172, and H. Ince Anderton, March 17, p. 202.

*The Drinking Match* (C. R. Beard), p. 155.

Date of Wharton's ballad. Note by P. J. Dobell, March 17, p. 202: reply by C. R. Beard, March 24, p. 217.

**— March 10—**

John Donne and Parliament (I. A. Shapiro), p. 172.

Member of 1601 and 1614 parliaments?

**— March 17—**

Shakespeare's Punctuation (Peter Alexander), p. 195.

New Manuscripts of Richard Rolle (Hope Emily Allen), p. 202.

Note by G. C. Heseltine, April 14, p. 271.

*Lyrical Ballads* (Hugh Macdonald), p. 202.

Issues of early editions.

**— March 24—**

Sterne in Bond Street (Lewis P. Curtis), p. 217.

Identification of his lodgings.

**— March 31—**

Chapman's *Iliad* (Howard Samuel), p. 230.

Unrecorded copy of 1598 edition.

**— April 7—**

Pepysiana (R. G. Howarth), p. 250.

Biographical points from the correspondence. Note by E. S. de Beer, April 21, p. 291.

Coleridge's Notes (Alice D. Snyder), p. 250.

Further MS. notes.

**— April 14—**

Hardy and *N.E.D.* II. (George G. Loan), p. 271.

Further list of unrecorded words.

A Note on Smollett's Language (J. M. Purcell), p. 271.

Use of phrases earlier than recorded in *N.E.D.* Further notes by Edwin Chappell, April 21, p. 291, and R. Stewart-Brown, April 28, p. 311.

Assegai : Bubbies (M. D. W. Jeffreys), p. 271.

Quotation from Astley's *Voyages*.

Horace Walpole and Sir Robert (Paget Toynbee), p. 271.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, April 21—

A Macaulay Find ? (W. Douglas Mackenzie), p. 291.

Marginal notes by Macaulay on the *History of England*.

Scott and Swift (A. L. Strout), p. 291.

Letter to Gavelin, March 1818.

The Duel in *St. Ives* (G. A. Parry), p. 291.

Parallel in Bristol Annals for 1808. Reply by W. F. Alexander, April 28, p. 311.

— April 28—

The Dates of the Waverley Novels (Una Pope-Hennessy), p. 311.

win

28,

.T

I  
e  
n

o  
o

i  
l